THAT I MAY SAVE SOME

WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL

243
Mc14

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

243.1
M744

OTHER BOOKS BY BISHOP McDOWELL

IN THE SCHOOL OF CHRIST
Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University

GOOD MINISTERS OF JESUS CHRIST
Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University

THIS MIND
Mendenhall Lectures at De Pauw University

MAKING A PERSONAL FAITH
Merrick Lectures at Ohio Wesleyan University

A MAN'S RELIGION
A Series of Letters to Men

The Earl Lectures of the Pacific School of Religion

THAT I MAY SAVE SOME

By

WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL

One of the Bishops
of the
Methodist Episcopal Church

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
243.1
BV M138t
13244
3770
.M146
1928

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1928, by
WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian

Printed in the United States of America

To the memory of

THEODORE SOMMERS HENDERSON

1868–1929

Bishop in the Church

Minister of Redemption

whose life was attuned to the

apostolic note,

"That I May Save Some"

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	PERSONAL FOREWORD	7
I.	THE DOMINANT IDEA	15
II.	THE ENLARGED MEANING	55
III.	MEANS AND MOTIVES	87
IV.	MOTIVES AND COST	117
V.	THE LIVING PERSONS	147

PERSONAL FOREWORD

THE opening paragraphs of the first of these addresses fully explain their origin. They constitute one of the brief courses of Earl Lectures and were delivered at the midwinter Convocation of the Pacific School of Religion in February, nineteen hundred and twenty-six. Later they were presented to various Annual Conferences and other gatherings of ministers. In nineteen hundred and twenty-seven they were given as the Alumni Lectures at Gammon School of Theology.

They are now published as Earl Lectures because of their presentation first in the series of Earl Lectures, with gratitude to all who have patiently listened to them both on the Pacific Coast and in the South.

The lectures also fully explain themselves and no preliminary words are really needed, except that here grateful acknowledgment may be made to countless persons and innumerable books for materials freely used in these pages. There is so much of this that only part of it can be specifically indicated, but it is all gratefully acknowledged here.

It would be almost a tragedy if anyone could now say anything original on this supreme

theme. It would be wholly tragic if we were not always attempting to present it in fresh and, if possible, better ways; if we should ever feel that on this subject the last word or the perfect word had been said.

This subject should never be allowed to grow stale or secondary in our thinking, nor allowed to become a specialty for specialists in our usage. This ought to be our perpetually burning bush, always flaming before our eyes and awaking wonder in our hearts. Coming near to it we ought always to be hearing God's voice calling us to the sacred service of setting his children free from their bondage and leading them to the land of life with Him.

I wish it were possible to indicate every indebtedness that actually exists in these pages, but I wish even more that I could reveal the extent to which emphasis upon the redemptive note has been found in unexpected places and in volumes not primarily concerned with this theme.

I knew what would be found in the classic books on evangelism. But in other works by the dozen, books not on that subject, written by men who do not belong at all to the specialist class, in the most marvelous manner this redemptive note has been heard, like the dominant *motif* of triumphant music. Maybe we shall come in a new, near day to hear it in all our literature and speech until men everywhere shall

feel the presence and power of the Redeemer of life and see what he is forever trying to make of men and the world.

There is an impression all too common that the schools of theology are wholly given over to and altogether interested in speculative theology. Many think that these schools are only interested in the overturning of old views or the destruction of the historic faith. I am glad to bear testimony that my experience at the Pacific School of Religion and at Gammon, as at other schools of theology, has given me a different impression and conviction. The best teachers and students alike are most deeply interested in the saving uses of religious truth and are more clearly than ever seeing that the center of all theology is the center where the redeeming God is. Many other centers than the redemptive center have been tried in the long history of the Christian Church, but this is the only one that will answer in our modern life.

This small volume is not published as a contribution either to theology or to scholarship. No one else knows its imperfections as does its author. It is offered as one more effort to get the church to singing again, singing anew, the song of the angels above the plains: "A Saviour is born."

Indeed, the small book itself has an evangelistic purpose. I once heard Bishop Andrews say

as he explained his desires concerning an address he was about to deliver on an important occasion: "I shall not have many more occasions equal to this. I must not fail to bear my testimony in this." It is forty-five years since I began to be a minister of Jesus Christ. More years are gone than remain. I, too, must bear my testimony. So I am trying in these addresses to lift these questions out into the clear light:

Is "saving some" the dominant note in our modern ministry? Is it so interpreted as to make it a vital note? Is it forever enlarging, as vital things like faith and love and redemption must enlarge?

Has it behind it and in it methods and motives that will carry it with persuasive and continuous power in these modern days and conditions?

Is it being kept in its supreme place, even as Jesus kept it in that place by all means and at any cost?

Is it being maintained as it must be in life and in a religion like Christianity, which is so intensely personal, on its eternally personal basis, according to Christ's own practice? Or has it been allowed to get off that personal basis and become abstract and impersonal, a thing of views rather than a vital concern of persons? Is Jesus actually getting what he eternally longs for, saved persons, saved churches, saved nations, saved races, who in turn are saving persons,

saving churches, saving nations, saving races, sharing with him continually the travail of his soul?

This seems a theme "vital to the modern ministry."

And the small book is sent out in the name of the Supreme Person who was called Jesus because he would save his people from their sins.

I. THE DOMINANT IDEA

LECTURE I

THE DOMINANT IDEA

SOME months ago I received a telegram from the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California, inviting me to give one of the minor courses of lectures on the Earl Foundation. The message said that "any subject vital to the modern ministry" would be appropriate. It did not define the word "vital," nor insist that only the most vital current subject should be chosen, nor that the most vital subject in history or for the future should make the theme of the addresses. All it said was, "vital to the modern ministry," with the fair inference, politely omitted but inescapable, that the treatment ought to be as vital as the subject.

The telegram came to me in an Iowa college, where I was spending a couple of days, and made me face up immediately to two questions: First, what is the quality of vitality in the ministry? and, second, what is the modern ministry? These are not very comfortable questions. Dean Inge says that "the most vital thing to the modern ministry is its own vitality," which would almost seem like saying that the most essential thing to a living thing is its life. If vitality is the quality

of being alive, or real, or necessary, like the words of Christ, then we must make sure that we have vitality. Maybe we have only the name to live and are really dead, like the church in Sardis that had the name of being alive but had actually ceased to be alive. Maybe for the ministry vitality is the modern equivalent for the "prophetic note" which we praise so much and sound so seldom. Maybe it is the modern equivalent for inspiration, for speaking as "moved by the Holy Spirit." Anyhow, the word sets a whole lot of disturbing questions running in an age that speaks and writes so much which is woefully lacking in vitality, so much that is not necessary at all. We do not need to define the term too carefully. We feel it when we come in contact with it and miss it when from speech or sermon it is absent. For when vitality is absent then neither speech nor sermon matters. And that is fatal, not vital.

Moffatt uses the word at least twice in very suggestive ways. In the letter to the Romans he refers to "a sense of what is vital in religion" (2. 18), and writing to the Philippians he prays that "your love may be more and more rich in knowledge and all manner of insight, enabling you to have a sense of what is vital" (Phil. 1. 9).

And what is the modern ministry? It ought to be that living ministry which we are in and of which we are actually a part; but it is not inevi-

tably that. It does not follow that a man *in* the present is *of* the present. He may be living wholly in some past century in his thinking and feeling. Or he may be living in some vague future to which the world has not yet come. It is interesting, of course, to think what we might have done if we had lived in Luther's time or to dream of what we would do in some age that has not arrived. Men in the ministry often utterly fail in the parishes they have, remembering only the ones they have had or dreaming of those they hope for. But our ministry is like the ministry of prophets and apostles, primarily a ministry *to* our own age as our ministry is always *in* our own age. A subject, therefore, vital to the modern ministry must be chosen in such a way as to meet these two deep and severe tests: Has it the red blood of vitality in it? Is it vital for living men, modern men, who are alive now?

At the Mürren Conference in September, 1924, Dr. T. R. Glover said: "But now we are face to face with modern man—erect, armed by modern education, critical, skeptical, self-sufficient. You may not like it, but he is there and he dominates the situation, bestrides it like a Colossus; and it is well to realize it. He will not believe what we say. . . . And the question is, Have we got a gospel or an evangel for him? I want to urge he is worth keeping and worth capturing. And,

broad and long, you have there, as I say, the modern man, and there are two things I want to say about him: He is a dangerous figure, and he is the best thing we have got. Thank God for him" (*Review of the Churches,* January, 1925).

In the wealth of Christian truth there is more than one vital subject. "The whole stress of religion can never be laid upon one part of it" without great loss to religion itself. So for these studies I was not asked to select the most vital subject, much less to choose the only vital one; certainly not to choose one that had once been vital or might become so in some future time. The invitation seemed to demand present vitality, vitality for living ministers, which does not make the demand an easy one. This is the kind of demand made upon prophets and apostles in the olden time. They had to strike an essential note, speak a real and living word to the men who were alive when the word was spoken. Their messages get their permanence because of their genuine timeliness.

It chanced that I had with me there in that Iowa college one of the volumes of lectures delivered on the Earl Foundation by one of the major prophets of that line. (My position was to be that of a minor prophet.) In that volume were the noble words stating the purpose of the foundation as "the adequate presentation of Christian truth . . . upon themes calculated to

illustrate and disseminate Christian thought and minister to Christian life, thus serving the purpose of a high evangelism." There, in those words, seemed to be a subject vital to the modern ministry—"serving the purpose of a high evangelism." Could I treat it in a vital manner, so that it would appear or possibly become vital to this modern ministry? That was the burden that lay in the decision. I could easily discuss a subject. Anybody after forty years of public speaking can discuss subjects through four or five lecture hours. But could I so speak there in California, can I so speak here in Georgia, as to serve vitally the purpose of a high evangelism in our modern ministry? And in the hours that followed I became increasingly aware of the presence and interest of that other Minister, who is at once the Ancient of Days and our living Contemporary, saying at last, "Speak the speaking that I bid thee." And that I tried both in California and in Georgia to do.

I reach back to the writings of an earlier minister for the statement of the subject. It lies there in the first letter written to the Corinthian Christians, written when Christianity was young, eager and alive with purpose, when it had to make plain what it meant to do and reveal as clearly as it could its purpose, method, and spirit. That statement for early Christianity could not be made in any easy, casual manner as

one may dash off a note or a telegram. Casualness of spirit or of language would have been fatal to that new, young faith. But here are the words in which that early Christian minister tried to say it:

> For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.
>
> And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law;
>
> To them that are without law, as without law, (Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.
>
> To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.

"That I may save some!" There you have an object for a minister's life and not simply a subject for a clerical discussion. And as you read what goes before and what comes after, you get into an atmosphere and spirit that seem vital, living and quick even now as they must have seemed long ago. The words take us back to the fountain-head of purpose in the ministry. We see here one of the earliest, perhaps the greatest man in all our sober calling, struggling already with our everlasting problems of final intention, dominating, essential purpose, growing under-

standing, adequate motives, personal cost, vital spirit, and personal relations. And if the eyes of our understandings and hearts are sufficiently enlightened, we can easily see others near him as he writes, notably that One who has supreme meaning for all the others then and now.

What a calamity it will be if Paul misstates it, if he understates it, if he gets the wrong emphasis, if he becomes abstract, or confuses means and ends, if he speaks in the wrong tone or a bad spirit, if he makes the supreme thing look small or easy or cheap, or if he gets his own purpose a hair's breadth away from the purpose of Christ! Above all, what a tragedy it will be if he gets only ideas at the center and not living persons, the Saviour, Paul himself and other persons. You can save evangelism in any age only by keeping it on the highest level, keeping it full of the largest meaning and keeping it intensely personal. Of course Saint Paul used extravagant speech. He surely could not save anybody himself. No mere minister can. Why will men like him not speak more conservatively and carefully? Well, he used this strong speech not to conceal the smallness of his ideas but because the idea was so big it fairly groaned for expression. Many men use wild and extravagant words because words are all they have. But Saint Paul is so full of his object—not simply full of his subject—that he is not afraid of overstatement.

He does not weigh his words carefully or use them with refined and scholastic precision. He was not thinking of saving statements but of saving men. He sees all those living persons in the picture. He wants to get them all together that One may be the Saviour of all. And he is so absorbed in the purpose that he talks as though he would save them himself. And I think his Master there, the real Saviour, liked to have his minister so perfectly identifying himself with the purpose of his own life.

It is always interesting to get into Saint Paul's high moods. He never was afraid of them. We are self-possessed and do not fully trust our exalted moments. But when that older minister gets into these supreme experiences, he speaks with unrestrained freedom, not seeming to care much how his words at one time may match up with what he has said or may say at other times. His apparent contradictions of himself are only apparent though, and are due to his large way of dealing with large truths. Calm holders of moderate ideas can preserve a calm and judicial balance between their utterances. Impersonal writers upon impersonal themes can easily avoid both extravagance and inconsistency. But the thing Saint Paul was saying at a given time was the urgent thing at the time. That makes his letters human and keeps them alive until this day.

But now to our subject again: "That I may save some." I know your immediate reaction as you hear those words. You brace yourselves for a discussion of evangelism, with an inevitable reference to revivalism and a possible plea for a return to the "old paths" and "the old-time religion." You would have felt more hopeful about it as scholars if I had chosen the Ritschlian words, "the regulative idea of Christianity." That would at least *promise* a discussion of something besides a narrow and crass evangelicalism. It sounds scholarly at least. But I would rather start with Saint Paul's own words because before we get through with him we shall be all over the whole beautiful field of the meaning of Christ for human life. For we can only escape the deadliness and limitations that have got worked into certain great ideas through the centuries by a rediscovery of their full, original sense and by their reinterpretation in the light of the centuries and the life of today. Attempting to do this is a good deal like trying to bend the bow of Ulysses or wield the sword of Excalibur. But it is worth trying.

Right at the start we run into a difficulty due to the history and experience of words. Terms which begin their circulation by being alive always tend to harden with use. At last some of them become ossified or petrified. And when people hear them they at once assume that be-

cause they know the word they know its full meaning. On the other hand, if the familiar words are not used, then people conclude that the speaker does not believe in the things they once stood for and has abandoned the faith of the fathers. And there are many people trying to save a faith by insisting upon an exact formula, forgetting that phrases, however useful, do not keep faith alive. But let us admit that the use of the word "evangelism" brings us right up against a lot of opposition. I quote a recent widely read volume:

"Evangelism has been under a cloud. It has been associated with a crudity of thought and expression, a sensationalism of method and a purely emotional appeal, to which thoughtful men could not conscientiously subscribe. It has been identified with all that is most reactionary in the life and thought of the church, with a blind literalism and an obstinate obscurantism that have repelled enlightened minds in every communion—with an unlovely dogmatism altogether alien to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ."[1]

It has also been quite too widely identified with a method, the method of a certain type of revival. To many minds an evangelist has come to mean a specialist with practices that are well known, usages that instantly suggest themselves, a man with a "bag of evangelistic tricks." Evan-

[1]Reprinted from *Evangelism in the Modern World*, edited by D. P. Thomson. Copyright, 1924, by George H. Doran Company.

gelism has become highly specialized, and in some cases probably capitalized and possibly commercialized. And there is a widespread reaction against these features. All too many men in the ministry have come to think a teaching ministry or a social ministry quite superior to a saving ministry. And there are many churches, fine churches at that, which would hardly like the reputation of being evangelistic churches. They wish to be regarded as doctrinally evangelical but not actually evangelistic. All this evil condition is largely due to an utter misconception of what a saving ministry or a saving church really ought to be. At the same time we speak such names as Finney, Moody, and Drummond with a reverence and affection not granted to many others in our history. Yet they were evangelists. They held clearly and firmly that men needed to be saved and that Jesus Christ could save them. They held quite varied opinions on many other subjects, but were one in this.

The same unfriendly reaction occurs in many circles against evangelicalism as a form of doctrine. Many ministers are no longer held or gripped in their minds either by the evangelical tradition or its forms of statement. The emphasis has shifted and lost somewhat of its edge. The dominating note is changed not by being abandoned but by being modified or muffled.

In historic evangelicalism everything headed up in the cross, and in the effort to adjust that controlling idea to newer conceptions and inevitable developments it has lost a measure of its traditional clearness and force. The two volumes on "Liberal Evangelicalism" issued within the past two or three years by some younger English clergymen are an effort to restate the evangelical position to the modern world, as that position is necessarily affected by modern knowledge, modern psychology, modern views, and, above all, by the modern mind and its way of looking at its problems. And one result of all this is that men get absorbed in the process of thinking it out, the process of making the intellectual adjustment and statement, and forget that meantime a whole generation passes which is not being evangelized. It is somewhat as though medical science should let one generation die while it studied methods, cures, and adjustments of the healing purpose to new science and new conditions.

Now, I have neither the training nor the disposition to attempt a theological task in these brief and familiar talks. I would like, if possible, to make such a statement of evangelism in modern terms, and of evangelicalism in like terms, as would help to make a new and modern mind for doing the work of an evangelist by all the ministry, and for such use of the whole truth

as it is in Jesus Christ as would make an essentially living evangelicalism for our day. We are in the stream of modern life. We cannot get out of it if we would, and we cannot ignore it or deny its presence and power. We are forced to do our work as good ministers of Jesus Christ in the world as it is. And I record my conviction that nothing can preserve the Church of Christ for its full, large work in the modern world except a new and modern interpretation and application of what Saint Paul meant when he wrote, "that I may save some." And nothing can save modern theology from crass reaction and obscurantism on one hand, or barren, pharisaical rationalism on the other, except a complete understanding of and participation in the total saving purpose of God in Jesus Christ. A partial evangelism will be of only partial use. A narrow evangelicalism will defeat the whole evangelical purpose. "We must not even try to lay the whole stress of the gospel upon one part of it." We must not weaken the gospel at its very heart by the omission of any of its essential features or by misplaced emphasis. We can save our terms only by using them in their fullest sense. The church has already weakened herself by a too easy surrender of the position that is hers alone, in which she is supreme, the truth that she has an essential message which no one else has.

These words of Saint Paul constitute the apostle's approach to and his interpretation of the purpose of Christ. Saint Paul was not the originator of Christ's plans, he was their interpreter. He did not create the mind of Christ, he sought to discover it and to disclose it. And when he sounded this dominant note he thought he was making plain the meaning of Christ in the world. You can never get the full meaning of Saint Paul's words except by going clear through them to Christ's own meaning. And I fear that we shall find the thought of our day all too largely out of harmony with Christ's own thought on some very vital matters, matters that are really vital to the modern ministry. Christianity is a peculiar religion in the things it puts in the supreme place and in the way it makes everything else fall into its proper place in the scheme. It proposes to do what all religions *more or less* propose, but the way it proposes to do its work makes Christianity unique among the religions of the world and absolute in the realm of religion itself. Many men have written and spoken of the essence of Christianity. They have not all agreed, and some of them have seemed to get secondary things in primary places, and to miss the supreme objective and spirit to which all the rest conforms and in which it all finds its own true and right place.

I do not attempt to conceal my own view in

regard to this. I set it out here as plainly as is possible for me, wishing all the time that I could do it infinitely better, that I could do it as it deserves to be done. I am not surprised at the wealth of Christianity in the ranges of its thought, the splendor of its usages and the glory of its perfect fruitage. What is at the heart of it requires all of this to give the heart of it perfect expression among men. For Christianity comes into the world of human life as a saving religion, a saving power for human life. "Saving some" is not a by-product in its purpose and problem. "Saving some" is at the center of it. Many things are true of the best God there is, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but the supreme truth about him is that he is, according to his own revelation, the saving God. His activity in the world is manifold and varied, marked by wisdom ineffable and power incalculable, but the dominant note of all his activity is the note of salvation for his children. The record of his gracious movement through the centuries is a marvel of intellectual significance, moral outlook, and literary perfection, but at the heart of it it is the record of his saving purpose and effort. The chief figure in the pages of that record, as in human history since Christ came, stands alone in his character, his holiness, his wisdom, his patience, and his power. There simply is no one else in the same class with Jesus Christ in

any century or on any continent. But the chief thing about him is that he is the world's Saviour. The chief personal revelation of Christianity is the revelation of the saving God in the Saviour, Jesus Christ, and the chief personal product of it is a new person, called a new creation, a new man in Jesus Christ. Its chief social outcome, far from perfect yet, is a saved and saving society called a kingdom trying to make on earth something like the society in heaven. There it is in all its plainness, and I venture to think in all its glory, too. If we were not so utterly familiar with all this that we are almost blasé about it, we would be looking around in awe and wonder at the radiance of it. We would be thinking it too good to be true. Who are we that we should hear angels singing in our night or see a Christ between us and our sins, or an open grave between us and our sorrows?

And the best ages of the church are those ages that have seen this view of God most clearly and held this view of the purpose of Christ most worthily and earnestly. And the best theologies are those that have this center. There are vast and imposing volumes of theology that are just theology, "only that and nothing more." Whereas the only true center for a Christian theology is a religious center. At the heart of it all must be the redeeming God and the redeemed life. Our controversies are over the teachings of

Jesus about God, but our deepest interest lies in discovering how Jesus opens the way and shows the way to life in God. Our controversies are over Paul's doctrine of the person of Christ. But our real interest lies in his experience of life in Christ and the meaning of that experience for us and all men. This is the only way you can keep the religious note supreme in theology. And when that note ceases to be dominant then even theology itself becomes arid, scholastic, and futile.

It is easy to lose that dominant tone, to dull that fine edge. Eternal harping on it will go far to destroy it. The gospel of saving some is not a fiddle with only one string, it is a harp of a thousand strings, like the harp of life itself. We can lose it by toning down Christ's supreme terms until we make them thin and faint. We can put Christianity on the defensive instead of keeping it savingly positive and aggressive. We can use it as a theory to explain evil in the world instead of as a divine power to cure evil and remove it from the world. We can muffle the dominant note by taking mild and complacent views of things that Christ evidently viewed with tremendous passion and seriousness. The heart of his passion was the passion to save men. That was what he came for. The name that he bore, the name we speak to children and repeat to men with reverence and affection, was given him be-

cause of its deep, permanent, dominant, desperate, glorious meaning; because that name, and that only, defined his purpose and mission in the world. It was not just one of many names, all equally significant. Only of that name can you say that there is no other given under heaven, or among men. And the thing that was primary with him in his ministry many have made secondary in theirs. The regulative, controlling idea in his life has become subordinate with them. The purpose that seemed so great to him, that made his life what it was, we have taken the urgency and size out of until it no longer controls us.

Take a single matter: Does our age hold as seriously as Christ did the moral condition of men? Does it not take, rather, a soft view of sin as compared with Christ's view? I am not concerned over our reaction against some of the crude literalisms and lurid imagery of the mediæval theologians and writers. The Dantes and Miltons and others who in poetry and sermon have reveled in verbal color do not attract our age much. And not everything historically related to Christianity is really of Christianity. But the saddest thing that could happen to the thinking of an age about human nature and its condition would be that it should miss or reverse Christ's view of human nature.

Or take another fact: We have greatly, wisely,

nobly broadened the range of Christian thinking. We hold vastly richer, truer views of human life and of Christ's life than many of our fathers held. But we do not hold richer, truer views than our Master held and holds. And in all too large measure the broadening of our own views has dulled the edge and muffled the dominant tone of his in our thinking. In getting away from our fathers' defective and imperfect views we have too often got away from Christ's. As a whole our modern age does not take Christ's view of sin, his view of the human need of a Saviour, or his deep and clear sense of himself as the Saviour. What was in the foreground of his consciousness and thought is too far in the background of ours. We have our own enthusiasms but we do not have his sense of urgency due to men's lack of God in their lives. We vex the souls of men by our debates as to Christ's person. We are passionate in our orthodoxy, but we are all too much concerned to save doctrines or even statements of doctrine as compared with our eagerness to save men. That was his passion, and we ought never to take the edge off it.

Hugh Price Hughes' daughter said that her father "recovered for his church its ancient passion for the souls of men and set that passion as a living force in the stream of modern life and thought." The human mind is a queer thing.

It has a hard time with its own best expansions. It gets proudly into the stream of modern life and thought, rejoicing that this modern stream is so much broader and richer than the narrow stream in which the fathers swam or rowed. And it exhausts itself in the mere joy of being in the modern stream. Or that same queer human mind keeps entirely out of the modern stream while it tries to hold fast an ancient passion for saving men. It seems hard to hold evangelistic intensity and theological breadth in the same mind. What is the real meaning of having zeal *according* to knowledge? Do we not forget how far our problems were also the problems of Jesus? He came into the world as the heir and servant of a passion that had been lost. He came into a *world* that was new. Into the stream of what was modern life and thought in his day he came, came with that ancient passion to bruise the head of the serpent that destroyed men, came with that burning, flaming passion that the best souls had seen in long gone centuries, and lost. The world had changed. His day was not as Abraham's. Saint Paul would reach cities like Ephesus and Corinth, Rome and Athens, all new in their character and conditions. Their life could not be crowded back into the life of the world before Abraham. If ever men had a right to wail over new and modern conditions as affecting the saving of men, Jesus

and Paul had that right. Jesus could have pitied himself as he tried to work in the Jerusalem of his day. He might have mourned that the older prophets had all the advantage of him. And Paul had relatively as tough a time in Corinth and Athens as any modern preacher has in New York, San Francisco, Berkeley, or Atlanta. Jesus and Paul were always up against new conditions. The conditions in which men live and work are always modern conditions.

But that Master of life, that Captain of Salvation held the purpose of his life steady and kept the passion of his life warm, kept his mind open to new truth and new conditions, right straight through the days of his flesh. He always ran true both to form and spirit. He never forgot what he came for. He was saturated with the idea of saving. He kept a primary relation to the primary matter and only a secondary relation to the things that were secondary. He sought first the first thing.

There is no other center than the center he kept. At the center of his life and ministry he was the Saviour of life. In the simple but true words of Dora Greenwell:

"He did not come to judge the world, he did not come to blame;
He did not only come to seek, it was to save he came.
And when we call him Saviour, then we call him by his name."

The modern minister only gets into the heart of his modern ministry by getting into the heart of Christ's own ministry which was and is genuinely modern. We have caused a deal of confusion and a sorry weakening of our ministry in modern days by getting somewhat off the center, by smothering the dominant note. The Bishop of Durham sadly says: "The notes of authority, undoubting conviction and assured belief which have marked the greater preaching of the past are now largely absent. The unavoidable shadow on the religious ministry in time diffuses doubt and intellectual confusion." And the able Dean of Saint Paul's exclaims: "The golden age of the pulpit is over." The Editor of the *Hibbert Journal* talks of "The Lost Radiance of the Christian Religion," the *British Weekly* of "the lost confidence of non-conformity." And all too many are seeking, as it seems to me, in the wrong place for the cure for this tragic condition. The modern ministry cannot speak with authority, or assurance, or clear conviction except from its own true center. *The area of its reach is wide, its circumference is large, but it has only one true center.* It must stand there with Jesus Christ if it is to do in this time the work which the time imperatively demands. It cannot recover the lost radiance just by a more amiable message to the world, nor by any other process than the rediscovery and the new use of

that radiance which broke upon the world's night, its moral night, its spiritual night, its mental night, when the Saviour came into our world. Of course the golden age of the pulpit passes when the pulpit dulls its one most golden note. It can smite upon all the chords with *power* only when the right one is in control. Liberalism is the only thing that will save Christianity. And evangelicalism, the redeeming passion of Christ in liberals, is the only thing that will save liberalism.

An Indian missionary recently asked Harnack this question: "Where do you find the seat of authority in Christianity?" And the keen old thinker replied: "This is the central question. The seat of authority in Christianity is at that point where the Jesus of history meets the Christ of experience." You cannot get the real note of authority unless you seek it at the right place, fill it with the right spirit, dominate it with the right purpose and motive, and keep it true to the facts of life and deepest needs of life. There is no way to "make enough of Jesus Christ," to put it bluntly, except to make enough of him as the Saviour of men. The world does not and will not have its religious convictions deepened, its faith made more sure, its real life transformed simply by the coming into modern life of another Saint Paul or Saint Francis, another Luther or Wesley, another Moody or Drummond. These

were all ministering spirits. But the source of deeper convictions, surer faith, renewed life is not in them, but in that everliving Saviour whose passion for men is unweakened and I trust unwearied.

Our theologies will break down, in part have broken down, at their heart. Our social Christianity has in too large measure ceased to be effective because it has got off its only real center. Theologies can be made Christocentric and remain scholastic and arid. Minds can be made theological, or social, or practical, or mystic, or even expository without being made evangelistic, and all these minds will be futile and impotent unless the passion for "saving some" dominates and controls them. And "saving some" does not mean saving some doctrines, but saving some people. After Andrew Bonar's death Sir W. Robertson Nicoll said of him that "His preaching was full of urgency. Earnestness about truth is not the same as earnestness about souls. All of Bonar's preaching made for the great ends of conversion and sanctification and was ruled by a desire for results." I know the difficulty of putting the discussion of a familiar subject on any other level than that which it has reached in our common thinking. It is easier to start a new discussion on a high level than to lift an old one to a high level. All the accretions of all the sad years and experiences drag great words and

great subjects down in our minds. We need a new inspiration of the Spirit to redeem our minds from their ordinariness. But what do you suppose those singing angels meant when they said Saviour? What do you suppose Jesus himself meant, all through his ministry, clear past Gethsemane, and Calvary? What do you think Saint Paul meant when he wrote these words, the newest personal interpretation of the proposal of Jesus? We have piled up on Jesus a dozen other terms, all of them true, all of them descriptive of his large, abundant ministry, all of them bearing upon it. But this modern ministry, capable, educated, progressive, broad-minded and eager, which sees the larger vision, which knows the value of social service, religious education, and political righteousness, can save Jesus Christ for *these* high uses only by a living use of him as the Saviour from sin. We cannot save our theology, whether it be conservative or progressive, unless it can bear the test of religion, which makes clear issue with evil and always aims at salvation.

For theology is not like anything else. It bears into the severe issues of life. Does it work in life? Does it lead men to Christ the Saviour? Saving value is more important to religion and theology than any other value they have. One hates to use the big, thunderous words, but surely these quotations are true: "Every theology must

bear fruit in a soteriology unless it is to be cut down as a cumberer of the ground." "It is the business of Christianity to save men and not to weave theories, and whatever does not promote salvation is damned already thereby."

Evangelicalism is much more than a system of doctrine, or a set of special doctrines, or a way of regarding the sacraments, or a theory of the ministry. It permeates all of these, making all of them important, and saving them from their own inherent tendencies. But evangelicalism is in its essence a saving way of holding and using the truth that frees, the truth that is called saving truth; that gets into the inner meaning of doctrines, sacraments and ministry, even into Christ's own conception of them; really a saving way of thinking of men. There is an enormous amount of first-class ability in the church being used wholly in the saving of doctrines, sometimes in the saving of phrases. Men forget that at last neither fundamentalism availeth anything, nor modernism, but a new creature in Christ Jesus. They forget also that theology is a by-product, not a direct one, and that the only atmosphere in which sound doctrines can be discovered or stated or preserved is the evangelical, even the saving, atmosphere.

And this does not mean a way of holding doctrines or a way of interpreting them. It is a way of saving men. I am thinking

very largely of the world's youth, not of its hardened manhood, though that is immensely important. We can make youth see Jesus as the Greeks wanted to see him. We can make youth see afresh what he came for. It will be hard, it *is* hard, to break the crust of habit, prejudice, tradition, and conservatism in men who are already set in their ways. But if the Church of Christ in this day, if this modern ministry, which is ours, will get to its true center with Jesus Christ the Saviour in his new journey up Calvary with the cross that turns not back, and with him at any cost, by every means, set out to save life from evil, I believe it will find again that radiant power over young men that made the early morning of Christian history shine like the sun.

Youth responds to the incarnation. It does not easily get hold of the atonement as usually interpreted. By all means, then, let us start with the appeal to youth which youth will understand and respond to. It will take Jesus Christ as its Lord and Redeemer. It will grow into appreciation of other phases of his work and life. But it is bewildered and befogged by the endless discussions which seem to get nowhere except to more discussion. It feels that something is wrong. It does not know what it is. It wants us to strike the right note. And we cannot win youth by throwing our emphasis even upon the deity of Jesus Christ as a doctrine or upon any

other doctrinal note as dominant. But we can win it, as we can win the world, by preaching Jesus Christ as the Saviour. Preaching is not simply the creating of an emotion, nor the pointing out of a duty. I venture to quote here what I have said elsewhere:

Here is our human race, near and far, in its sin, its ignorance, its weakness, and its sorrow, and for that race, near and far, in your small congregation and in the big world, the problem of all problems is ever the problem of the renewal of its life in moral character and strength, the fortification of its life against temptation and grief. And there is no other name given under heaven or among men but the name of Jesus. There never has been a really great preacher who tried any other. And there is no way to restore our ministry to such powers as it has lost except by setting again in the very center of that ministry Jesus Christ the Redeemer.

The chief end of revelation was redemption. The chief end of preaching is redemption. This is the center of Christian doctrine, the glory of Christian literature, the life of Christian ethics, the power of the Christian pulpit. Disaster and weakness have always followed Christian teaching and preaching when the chair and the pulpit, in teaching and preaching, have missed their proper emphasis. I know no way to save doctrine from its abstractness, literature from its emptiness, ethics from its impotence, the chair from its remoteness, the pulpit from its futility and littleness except by pouring again the stream of redemptive life into them all.[1]

[1]See *Good Ministers of Jesus Christ*, pp. 66-67. The Abingdon Press.

And I think it vital to the modern ministry to re-examine its conception of the Bible and probably in large part change its practical attitude to it. The Bible is the book of the preacher. It has a primary place in his life. We probably hold much larger and truer views of the Scriptures than our fathers held, but as we stop a moment to take account of things as they stand, we are compelled to admit that in the church as a whole we are in rather a sorry plight in our use of the Bible. Its traditional standing has been much disturbed. The new science, new psychology, historical criticism, and studies in comparative religion have all affected it. This is not new, to be sure, but it is the condition that is on us. John Wesley declared in his day that, if you gave up belief in witchcraft, belief in the Bible would have to be given up, and that Newton's theory of gravitation "tended to infidelity." The coming of the Copernican astronomy tremendously strained the preaching of the day. And now comes a modern group saying that the Bible and evolution are in deadly opposition, and young people are being faced up by Christian ministers to the wicked alternative stated in the words "Darwin or Christ." And many modern ministers are genuinely perplexed, while very many of them are trying to find their way out by paths that do not lead out. And some are just sitting down in their tangle, while others

are crying out violently that the times are out of joint, while still others are simply shutting their eyes to facts and going on, refusing all the time to admit that there is any change in conditions.

Well, is there a way out for a modern minister? I do not mean a way out of a hole. I mean a way for a free, confident, self-respecting, intelligent use of the Bible which will not compel a modern minister to part company with all the scholarship of his own age, and will enable him to retain the supreme, the imperative passion to save some which alone makes his ministry real and vital. If there is not such a way, then we are in a genuinely bad case and can only go forward doing useful but secondary things. The heart of the ministry will cease to be apostolic and the glory of it will be gone. I think there is such a way, not out of a hole, but to paths of power. It is to rediscover how the Bible happened to be and what it chiefly is in the heart of it. I have said in substance elsewhere what I here repeat as to what the Bible can be in the hands of earnest men, modern men, without any surrender of true intellectual life and without any reactionary, obscurantist attitude to recognized modern learning. And this is not taking refuge in a storm cellar. That would be cowardly. The new way, in my judgment, enables us to ascend a throne in the presence of all men, a securer, better throne than our preach-

ing ancestors found possible. We can never hold again certain views which we once thought we must hold, we can never use the Bible again as some have insisted in theory we must do. They themselves never did it in practice. Nobody ever could. The sanctified sense of the common Christian man has been wiser in actual practice than the decisions of councils when discussions have been academic and hypothetical. It was a bright day when Bruce's little book, *The Chief End of Revelation,* came into my hands, when I read what had then not been said to me, what has now become a commonplace: "The Bible chiefly relates to a purpose of grace and its great watchword is redemption." It is not a "repository of miscellaneous information on all sorts of subjects," but is the infallible record of how God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. It is not a detailed history of the universe, nor of humanity, nor of the Jews. It is, as Milman said, "a history of redemption." The most important movement that has occurred in our human race is that divine movement for man's salvation. The book that tells the story of it needs nothing else to make it the most vital book in the world. The purpose of God, culminating in Jesus Christ, gave tone and edge to the Bible. Many things have seemed to lower the tone and dull the edge. But it is a literature that does not lay equal emphasis upon everything, even

everything in its own pages. It is not the record of the revelation of just a generally good God, but it is the story of the God of Jesus Christ, the God of the redeeming purpose toward men, and that makes it a book of eternal value for us preaching men.

I have said in many places and printed more than once the statement of the question asked me by hundreds of students in these years: "What is the Bible good for?" And I delight to answer in the hope that my reply may help some to escape the evils involved in the confusing debate now going on. The Bible is the glorious story of how God came to men in sundry times and divers manners, but perfectly in his Son at last for life's salvation. And it is the guide for men seeking their way to God for salvation. Our Methodist fathers were neither Calvinists nor Unitarians. They rather fiercely challenged both, but they did it not in a doctrinal interest but with an evangelistic purpose. They were not out to save theology but to save men, and with that passion they tested all truth by its saving value. They tremendously believed as their sons do in the deity of Jesus Christ because they felt that only by such a Person can all men everywhere be saved.

They saw a perfect Redeemer in the Bible, bringing a "full, perfect, and sufficient" salvation to all men everywhere, coming "not for their salvation

only but also for the salvation of the whole world," and this was the heart of the Bible to them. This made it the Book it is, a Book by itself. This vision and understanding gave them their evangelical strength in a doctrinal, sacramentarian age, and their evangelistic urge in a formal, worldly age.

And *the primary use of it is to find the Redeemer in it.* Many other persons and very many other things can be found, but if men miss the Redeemer and redemption they are not getting to the heart of it. This is its center. The God revealed to mankind in its pages is above all the saving God. And in this day of many voices, some of them distracting voices, our church ought to be speaking in the sure voice of those who hold all their other views around this one as the center. It is not enough for anyone to hold better views. And it is pure pharisaism to hold any views with conceit. Evangelical insight must be matched and must be saved by evangelistic fervor. Otherwise the light becomes darkness."[1]

And again, I know no way to save the Bible for its real use in the modern world, or to keep our modern ministry in its true place, except such an understanding of the Bible and such use of it in the world whose character is broken, and which is vainly trying to find another name by which it can be saved.

When we come to speak of the "Enlarged Thought of Salvation" we shall see that this thing that Jesus came to do was no petty, trifling

[1]Tract: *A Real Use of the Bible,* William Fraser McDowell. The Methodist Book Concern.

thing, small in itself and possible to just anyone. And then we shall see why the Bible is such a radiant book. It is because redemption is such a glorious thing. Saving men is—I speak it reverently—God's own supreme achievement. He has done nothing else, is doing nothing else better than this.

Finally, for to-day, I am sure we need to reexamine and restate the place of "saving some" in the plans and purpose of the church. Here is the place to recover the lost radiance, to regain our power to make mighty affirmations free from ambiguity and uncertainty. We cannot, in this modern period, with authority tell people what they must believe on all subjects or what they must do in all situations. Modern Protestantism neither has nor should it claim any such authority over its members. And many ministers are failing to see where the real authority of the Bible, the real authority of the church and its ministry lies. In the confusion over this and the question of infallibility we are sounding too many minor notes and failing to sound the major note where we really have the right to sound it. It is the fate of men in great controversies to accomplish sometimes more, sometimes less and sometimes other than what they set out to accomplish. Hutton says that the Reformation theologians were really contending for the authority of the Bible against

the authority of the church in a particular region. He thinks they did not know that, "since people in the thick of such a conflict are usually the last people in the world to see what they do intend." He says:

"When they declared that the Bible was infallible, I do not think they really intended to claim for the Bible inerrancy, or authority in regions which we to-day would call scientific, biological, and the rest. I have always felt that the Reformation was contending for infallibility only on one issue, and that was the issue at stake at the moment, namely, the right of human access direct to God. In claiming the infallibility of the Bible they were simply claiming that on the authority of the Bible there is nothing to prevent a man from opening his solitude to God—that men may meet in the bush with God. From Genesis to Revelation, wherever there is a contrite heart and a suppliant spirit there a man may have fellowship with his Father in heaven."[2]

There we have it. We can admit fallibility in many matters for both Scriptures and church, but they must both infallibly lead men to God or they have no real use at all. The church loses when it assumes an authority it does not possess, or pretends to hold keys that never were given to it. But it can open and no man can shut the gate of saving access to Jesus Christ. And unless it strikes this note with authority it does not matter much what else it says or does.

[2]*Review of the Churches,* January, 1925, p. 119.

Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men! The Bible, the book of the divine Saviour and man's salvation! The church, the society of salvation! The modern ministry, the men set "to save some" at all cost and by all means! This is the most vital thing in the modern ministry. What a conception of salvation and saving we must have in order to compel and constrain us in this modern world! For if our vision of salvation is not big enough, it will not hold us. But if we can get Jesus Christ's view of it, I suspect we shall be stretching ourselves for the rest of our lives to measure up to it.

When this saving atmosphere and passion get lost or dimmed, the state of the church gets low and unspiritual. Then there are feverish, violent efforts to restore vital power and spiritual glow by new emphasis on doctrines, by new ethical legislation and efforts to regulate conduct, or by an intenser devotion to ordinances. Whereas there is only one way to make a spiritual church or to preserve spirituality in a church that has it and that is by Jesus' way, by Paul's way, of bending everything to the main purpose and doing it all the time and at all costs. This saves confusion, this keeps things in proportion, this creates and preserves the only atmosphere in which the church can use her truth, her ordinances, and her ministries. This gives a working doctrine of God, a working un-

derstanding of Jesus, and the Bible, a working theory of the church in the world, a working view of human personality, and a working understanding of Christianity as compared with other religions. These, then, are the real, final tests: Is your ministry a saving ministry? Are you bent on saving some? Is your church a saving church? Is your Bible the book of redemption in your hands? Have you got first things in the first place? Is the essential note dominant in your ministry? "If we aim at reform," said Lady Henry Somerset, "we shall fail. If we aim at redemption, we shall win."

But we cannot do anything with a small idea of saving some, or a static idea. And that starts us into another study.

THE ENLARGED MEANING

LECTURE II

THE ENLARGED MEANING

THE history of words is exceedingly interesting and instructive, as was said yesterday. Words that start out full of religious life and experience easily harden into doctrinal terms. Then we go on using the words thinking chiefly of their meaning for doctrine rather than their meaning for experience. In the end doctrinal standards thus become almost wholly verbal standards. Lord Charnwood, in his late volume on Saint John, declares that in its last state "zeal for standard doctrine has destroyed the sense that truth exists."

There is also the tendency of living truths to become identified with the phrases that state them, in utter forgetfulness of the fact that living truth is always growing truth and that words are eternally changing their meaning. Mental moods change from century to century, even though men use through the centuries the same language to express their moods. And this involves the tendency to think that we understand an idea or have the experience lying under it because we know the word which has been used to express it. Often we fancy we are keeping

the thing alive when we are really only maintaining a phrase in which it was once stated.

There is also a tendency to think of relations and experiences, which at their best can only be personal, in abstract, impersonal terms. For example, faith comes to be thought of as the acceptance of statements instead of as personal loyalty to a person. Under such circumstances faith becomes dogmatic and hard, and when it is full grown in its dogmatism, it provokes reaction into some other dogmatism which is just as hard as the first. Abstract fundamentalism and abstract modernism are vexing one another in this hard spirit and unfortunate manner at this very hour. Meantime the personal relation of a personal soul to the personal, living Christ goes for the time into the background.

There is also a tendency for great terms and experiences to diminish in size and content as time goes on. This is due to a variety of causes. Sometimes the diminution is caused by a false or undue emphasis upon one phase of the experience that the term describes; sometimes by identifying the whole truth with one part of it; sometimes by a failure to see the truth or experience in its wholeness or completeness; and sometimes it is caused by those evil, hostile influences in life that always take the glory out of our best thoughts, our best moods, our best experiences. For many people a religious idea or re-

ligious experience is largest when it is born. The hour of the beginning of their religious life is the largest hour they ever know in religion. And all this is sadly true in the very regions where it is most fatal when true, that is, in the realms of religious life and experience. These by their very nature must be forever alive and ought to be forever enlarging. Nothing is sadder than a religious experience which has never grown up, except one that has shriveled and become smaller than it was when it started.

Let us all the time remember the wise principle: "If we are to save our terms and definitions, we must constantly enlarge them." That is the law of all living things. It is the law of experience, of love, of life itself. It means very much, for example, when two earnest, high-minded, fine-souled youths speak their first words of love to one another. They will go through their lives using the same words, but in any real experience of wedded love the words will mean ever more and more as life goes on. So with the words with which we try to express our faith or tell a living experience. I cannot tell when I began to say, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." I keep on saying these words, but they would not be serving me well if they had not stretched and grown through the years of effort, of work, of sorrow and joy, of enlarged understanding, of the deepening sense that God is like Christ in

character and spirit; years with open graves in them, years with a close view of the non-Christian world which gave the words an absolutely new meaning.

All the time we are thinking of our text, that personal statement of that early preacher, "that I may save some." And in order to get those words with power into our own modern ministry we must rescue them from their small, their reduced, their formal, perhaps their ecclesiastical or denominational meaning, and interpret them truly for ourselves and to our age, even though the enlarged conception bursts all the precious verbal wineskins in which we have so carefully kept our standards. The only way to save our verbal wineskins is to put into them static truth, truth that is not growing. The modern world needs and probably wants religion, and is not happy in being offered any substitute for it. And if Christianity is to win the modern world, it must use its largest truth and state it in its most living terms. I repeat what I said in substance yesterday. The Christian Church will last a long time even on its present basis, but it will not win the world or conquer it on the present basis at all. It is not in sufficient measure a saving church for that supreme achievement. And it cannot save the world at all if it uses a small theory of salvation. It can save a few people. It can do many people much good,

but the modern church cannot do the work of the Christ of Nazareth, who is the living Christ to-day, unless it puts into its conception of salvation the height, the depth and the breadth of meaning that he put into it, that in this modern world he still puts into it. His church must think of salvation as he thinks of it. The modern church must put behind its vision of salvation his eternal passion for it and his majestic conception of it. Somebody will recover the idea of salvation from the shallow, narrow, superficial conceptions of it that have gathered around it through the centuries, that have been put into it by all the churches, some making one small emphasis and some another, and whoever does this will deserve well of the world. It is easy for us to get the little into the foreground but the church that will save the world will get the great out of the background, and give it its supreme place.

I am not conceited enough to believe that I can do this. I will sit at the feet of any man who will do it. Maybe together here we can get a glimpse of the path we must tread if we are to find this great thing. For if Protestant Christians do not find this way and walk in it, it matters only a little what we do find. We can be useful, but we cannot be omnipotent even in Christ's name except on Christ's eternal basis. We can win the world only by making real and

perfect to the world all that Jesus the Saviour said and wished, says and wishes for a man, for a race, for a nation, for the world. We can be anchored to a small conception but we can sail only under full steam with a large one.

Bartlett and Carlyle in their work, *Christianity in History,* say: "A religion is molded by its idea of salvation. It is in this that continuity of type mainly consists and may be brought to the test." The very fate of Christianity depends upon its clear holding of the dominant note of salvation, but the fate of this dominant note itself depends upon the way it is held and expressed. It cannot continue to be the ruling idea of a religion like Christianity if it is held feebly or as an idea that is static or small. Christ's conception of it is necessary to explain his life and character. Savonarola said to his tormentors, "My secrets have been few because my purposes have been great." You will miss the secret of Jesus entirely if you see his purpose or his idea of salvation as a small or static thing.

Now, maybe by a series of sober questions we can open up the problem we shall have to solve in a practical way before we are through with our work in the world. It is worth while to ask ourselves questions that we cannot adequately answer, to stretch our spirits on problems that are forever too big for us, to pursue in our minds an eternally flying goal. It is a dreadful thing

for a man to catch up with his own horizon. I would not be treating you or myself fairly if I refrained from asking these questions. They would not be worth asking if they could be easily, glibly, and jauntily answered. We are face to face with the very soul of our ministry in this modern world. If our ministry is not a saving ministry, it is not much of a ministry of Christ at all. But it does not help a bit to make or hear just vague, general, commonplace statements like that. If we are going to get out of our present sad plight, we have got to get much deeper into our royal problem. We cannot get in by backing out. We can get out only by honestly trying to go clear through. Take, then, a series of questions, not new or startlingly put, but very real even as put in familiar and commonplace terms.

1. Do the men and women of our day need such a thing as salvation at all?

2. Why do they need it if they do need it?

3. Do we need to revise in any essential way the meaning we attach to that historic term? If so, what must be put into it, or taken out of it, or what readjustment of elements is essential in the light of our later thinking and our current psychology or in the light of our actual acquaintance with the lives and experiences of men?

4. Can men be saved by any other person than themselves or by any power other than their

own, their own resolution, their own growth? If so, by what or by whom? What can a man do for himself and within himself to achieve what would fairly be called a redeemed life?

5. What had Saint Paul in mind when he wrote? He usually employed words carefully, even though he was, as all men must be, under the influence of his own race and history, the religious teaching and philosophy of his own age. What did he actually mean?

6. What did Jesus mean, what does he mean, to do (1) with a person? (2) with a race, like his own? (3) with a nation, like the Jewish or the Roman? What were his dreams, what had he in his head, when he said, "Go into all the world and make disciples of all nations"? What is the bearing of such utterances upon the idea of being saved, upon evangelism? (4) What did he mean to do with a world?

7. What does the salvation of a person mean in the light of modern psychology, modern pedagogy, the modern interpretation of personality, modern social science, modern knowledge of racial qualities, modern knowledge of comparative religion, modern national conceptions and international ideas? In other and general terms what does salvation mean, if it means anything, to modern life in its full reach?

We could get into the same focus of our problem by seriously asking ourselves the immediate,

the direct, and the large permanent meaning of certain exact words spoken by Jesus and written by Saint Paul. We cannot wholly escape the conventional meanings that have become attached to them, we cannot ignore the course of Christian history as these sentences have moved through it. We would not if we could. But we ought not to be enslaved by the conventional views or so mentally and spiritually possessed by them that we cannot get a fresh, modern, and, if possible, enlarged view of them. When Jesus said "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost," was he thinking of anything beyond a new man, a redeemed man, a "man rescued from evil and restored to fellowship with God"? Or was he *ever* unconscious of the wider reach of salvation? In other words, did our common and unworthy antithesis between different kinds of salvation—individual, social, national and the rest—ever have any place in his thoughts? He used the same word the disciples did when they were scared in the storm on the lake and cried out asking him to *save* them lest they perish. Indeed, not to overwork the idea but just to keep it clearly before us, we have to remember that many words look both ways, up and down, or out and in; take the long view and the short one, or have a large meaning and a small one within themselves. And in answering these questions as to Christ's mean-

ing, we have always to guard against giving *our* meaning to *his* words, which is usually the process of reduction. Our wisdom lies in stretching our minds to grasp his ideas and in keeping on stretching them with the expanding significance which always marks large, living terms.

With all too many men and women religion does not transform them into Christlikeness. They transform it after or into their own likeness. Maybe that is why we have so many types of Christian life, like Protestant and Catholic, Methodist or Presbyterian, Anglican or Lutheran, so few of them Christlike types except in vague or partial ways.

Now, we have always taken for granted that men are to be saved from their sins. And it is said that "the modern man is not thinking about his sins." And then it is assumed, in our democratic way, that the modern man will not stand for any talk about sin nor for any mention of necessity for salvation from sin; and that what the modern man will not stand for must be abandoned. Democracy is rather queer in spots. It calls for the most tyrannical conformity to its views. Maybe the modern man is not thinking about his sins. That is really no sign that he ought not to be. Human history is full of examples of popular thinking gone wrong. Sometimes salvation and wisdom lie in the saving remnant, not in the majority. Possibly we can-

not get the modern man to think of sin in the terms and figures of the past, but the change of description does not render the thing itself any less real or dreadful. Things like evil and pain do not cease to exist just because they are called by softer names or described in other terms. The word "sin" is not popular. The discussion of it is not agreeable or easy. It used to seem easy, and in some circles still does. Some of our preaching fathers appear to have reveled in the discussion of it. They talked of it as if they enjoyed it. That is no longer possible. But modern psychology, modern science of all sorts has given a terror to the thing that used to be called sin that makes all those old, lurid pictures seem rather colorless and tame. It is hard to see how a trained mind can think of the mess that human nature is in, the nature of evil as modern science discloses it, the wide social reaches of individual sin, without getting a vital insight into the very sufferings of Christ. For his suffering was not due to his own hunger or his homelessness or any merely physical thing. It was due to his unerring insight into the ravages wrought in human life by what we call evil. He had no illusions about it at all. He did not argue over terms. But it seemed to him that the men of his day needed something they could not give themselves, something that only the saving God could give them. No matter what anybody

called it or calls it now. We ourselves are not much moved by Milton's or Dante's pictures or by Jonathan Edwards' dreadful picture of "sinners in the hands of an angry God." We neither worship nor preach a God whom we think of in mediæval terms. We worship and preach the God of Jesus Christ. But that does not ease things up a bit. The God of modern science and the God of Jesus Christ make sin look infinitely worse, infinitely more destructive to human life, to human relations; give sin a reach into the soul that sins, and other souls than the one that sins; give it a meaning in personality and character that are all too much for words to paint or for the mind to think out. Nobody can take the modern view of the nature of evil cheerfully. And if this modern man is not thinking much about his sins, he is simply shutting his eyes and his ears, simply closing his mind to everything that modern science and the Christlike God alike are trying to say to him. The worst judgment ever passed upon men is not the judgment of being punished for their wrongdoing. It would be a poor world where wrongdoing had no penalties. The worst judgment of all is that men close their eyes lest they see, shut their ears for fear they will hear, choose darkness when light comes, and walk off in darkness as though it were light. I do not care much what you call all that. Perhaps there is no adequate name for it.

But maybe we are not getting very far into our real problem by this line, though I think we had to come over this line at least this far. In the light of modern psychology and other science what did Jesus Christ try to do in a person, to a person, for a person, through a person that may fairly be described as saving him? I am not very anxious in these studies to state a doctrine of sin adequately or establish the fact that sin is in the world. My purpose is not theological or doctrinal but practical. I am really trying to see and to say what Jesus and Paul mean by salvation or by "saving some" so that we modern ministers will have their passion and go into the thing with them. The horror of sin moves me as it must move any thoughtful person. But the glory of redemption moves me much more deeply. What Jesus tried to get men into is much more impelling than what he tried to get them out of. The vision of what is positive and constructive in the work of Christ is much more inspiring than any other features of his work.

I wonder if part of our reaction against current conceptions is partly, perhaps largely due to the overemphasis upon their rescue features, if we have not too much identified saving some with salvaging some from the wreck. The rescue element in "saving some" is absolutely real and imperative. Brands must be plucked from the

burning. But we do not help our cause by treating this process as though it were the supreme thing or the only thing in the work of salvation. My dear friend Bishop Birney says we must think of saving in three aspects, namely, "saving the lost, saving from loss, saving the saved." Rescuing men was not the whole thing in the ministry of Jesus. There is a difference between reality and exclusiveness. And when you ask what Jesus meant to do in the life of a man, you are not fully answered by the statement that he meant to rescue him either from sin or from hell or from both, though he clearly did mean to do that. Nor does it cover the case to say that he means to rescue him from fear or from selfishness, or covetousness, or any of the special forms of evil, though he clearly does mean to do that. Many men assume that the work of Christ is done in them or in others when the power of an evil habit or degrading appetite is broken. That is always a true work of Christ, but it is never the complete work of Christ. Breaking a chain is essential to a life of freedom, but it is very far from being the freedom that belongs to the sons of God. Is it not true that in our history saving men has been too largely identified with rescue exclusively or with the beginning of the saved life? You take the average saved man, and he will readily and confidently name the date when he was saved, meaning the date when he

entered into the saved life or began to become a saved man. That experience seems so wonderful to him that he gives it an overwhelming place in his thought. And it is a wonderful experience. No wonder men sing rapturously and gratefully,

"At the cross, at the cross, where I first saw the light,
And the burden of my heart rolled away.
It was there by faith I received my sight
And now I am happy all the day."

But surely again that is only the beginning in time and a part in quantity of the total desire of Christ for a man. That is birth into the new life, but a babe whether physical or spiritual that never grows up is a sad sight. You think of babes as of everything else in the light of what they are going to become when they have reached their full development. That is because man belongs not to his past but to his future. His home is the place he is bound for. The very essence of salvation is in its forward look. We have not made a mistake in our emphasis upon the importance of *starting* men on the homeward pathway, in helping prodigals who are away from home to come to themselves, to realize where they are, to remember the old home, and urging them to say, "I will arise and go home." Nor is it strange that that decision should bulk so large in men's experience. It would be strange if it were not attended by strong emo-

tion. It involves such a change of mind, such a change of attitude, such an act of will, that it actually does revolutionize the ordinary life. Nor is it strange that the men who persuade other men to make this decision, to take this step, should be held in such regard; that they should even get in a class by themselves and be the despair of many other men.

But we are not taking Christ's full view of salvation or of the process of saving a man when we so largely identify it with what is only its necessary beginning. "We can save our definitions and conceptions only by enlarging them." We shall lose the passion for doing Christ's work unless we are moved with the vision of what *in the large* he meant to do in a man, what *he* meant by saving a man. Salvation has been thought of as "a divine rescue from an external peril," and has been called "the *entrance* into a man's life of some holy power." But surely this does not cover the whole case as we look at what both Jesus and Paul said about it and evidently tried to do about it. Salvation cannot stop short of making real and vital all that Jesus said and wished for a man, for a race, for a nation, for the world. What is redemption or salvation but another way of saying reconciliation with God? And what is that but harmony with God in character, in principles, in will, in affections, in thoughts and in purposes? That is the only

meaning to the words "Get right with God." It means a whole world more than just getting *your* miserable personal sins forgiven and acquiring a feeling that *you* are all right, that you have got your own debts paid, your own soul fixed up some way; and very much more than just getting started on the way. Many men in the New Testament time got only the beginning. Some, like the rich ruler, failed right at the start because they lacked heart and vision to go the whole length with Jesus. They were willing to be saved for themselves. That was the trouble with the Jews in their lapse from their historic call. They were not saved, just as most men are not saved to-day, to Jesus' full ideals for personal character, to his full ideals for society, to his principles for individual life and for organized life among men. Their salvation had small service content, was tainted with a false sense of privilege which was selfishness in its essence, and at last went the wrong way as between life and ritual, life and doctrine. They were not saved, as far too many of us are not saved, to Jesus Christ's full view of life, to his full teachings about life, to his costly view of holiness in life, to his perfectly desperate doctrines and principles of human relationships, or to his unfaltering hope of what he always called a kingdom, to sharing his aspirations and unchanging purposes.

We talk glibly enough about personal salva-

tion, as though in Christ's view of salvation there are several kinds and as though we are free to choose which kind we will take. Men choose to-day to go as far as they wish and no further. They accept some of Christ's principles, but not all by any means. They become pacifists, or non-resisters on his authority, but lay up treasures in the shape of war profits in defiance of his authority. The rich ruler did not want Christ's kind of salvation at all; he only wanted the kind he wanted. And a lot of the others wanted to be saved as Jews, with all their prejudices and inhuman attitudes, just as a lot of us want to be saved, if at all, as Anglo-Saxons, or as Nordics, or as Americans, or even as Californians, or Georgians, or as capitalists, or as laborers, or as scholars, or as nice people.

And a man who does not believe in the salvation of the individual but only in social salvation is going to have a hard time with the story of Jesus and his dealings with those Peters and Matthews and women at the well. If he thinks that just any kind of a person can be built into Christ's kingdom or help Christ build his kingdom, he will have to shut his eyes to the plain teaching of the New Testament as well as to the facts of life. Jesus Christ himself was not the kind of Person he was just that through the centuries men might admire him and make a doctrine about him. If he had been any other sort of

a person, an average person, even a more than average person, he might just as well have stayed away. The world had had plenty of partial voices and broken lights, men with "ifs" and "ands" in their characters, men who could go part way with their own lives and not quite so far in their passion for other lives. "Last of all he sent unto them his Son." It takes a soul to move a soul."

A careful student has said:

"The modern spirit rebels against the onesidedness of that ideal of life which has been offered to it in the name of Christianity. . . . Our religion has to be conceived in some more comprehensive way, it has to allow more fully for the diversity of life and admit many elements which it has insisted on excluding, before it will recover the tribute of the modern world. . . . The spiritual decline is rather to be explained from this—that the progress in life as a whole has outrun the religious progress. For the old needs the inherited faith was sufficient, but all at once came the enormous access of power, freedom, opportunity. We are growing conscious in these days that the old faith cannot bear the strain, and on all sides there is a growing cleavage between life and religion."[1]

This whole thing of saving some has lost its challenge to a lot of us men because we are not thinking of it as Jesus evidently did think of it.

[1]E. F. Scott, *The New Testament To-day*, pp. 77-79. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York, 1923.

And we are consuming our lives in a score of petty ways while our Master toils up new Calvaries all over this present mad, wild world. And we are complacent and argumentative while his spirit bleeds. He is the same, yesterday, today and forever. But that is not chiefly a doctrinal fact, that is a personal fact. He has not ceased to be the kind of Person he was when he was trying to save those early Jews, when he was wearing out his life, enduring shame, teaching on mountainsides and by the sea, suffering in Gethsemane and dying on Calvary so that he could bring men to a new relation to God, get them free from every kind of evil, break the chains of hell upon them, give them a new moral vision and a new moral power, get them into a new life of endless expansion, and make them new persons. And all those crowded years he was trying with apostles and disciples, with the few and the many, to get men who should be like him in personality, in purpose, in passion; men who would go the whole length with him in this divine enterprise; men who would not count the cost or think that they had gone far enough when they had tithed their efforts. He was not working according to the standards of Jacob, but according to wholly new standards. He never thought of short cuts either to personal character or to the kingdom. And he was trying every tragic day of his life, just as I think he is trying now

in days no less tragic for him, to get men to be like him, men to help him in the thing to which he gave and gives himself. And he knew that the full work takes time, as education does. No matter about the start, the process goes on without ceasing, or it fails. That was what "saving some" meant to Jesus. That was the big thing in his hands, the thing that we have allowed to grow small in our hands. That was what he meant by being an evangelist. No wonder modern travesties of that seem so like blasphemies to sensitive souls who love him.

But sensitive souls have no right to exhaust themselves nursing their sensitiveness, refined souls no business just preserving their refinement while they daintily deplore the crudities, the imperfections, the shallownesses, the superficialities that do so easily offend them. What is the use of our better theology, our newer psychology, our sounder interpretations and understanding of the Bible, our keener insight into human nature, our broader and more tolerant views of life, our more accurate science and more human philosophy, our vast extension of knowledge and refinement of life, our material conquest of the world if all this is only going to make out of us a new type of Pharisee that will just let Jesus do as well as he can while we give him a little help and a lot of admiration? I have not come to help you make a new the-

ology, but I have come again to this Western Coast and this Southern campus to plead with you in the largest way to take Jesus Christ the Saviour in dead earnest in the central, large, full passion of his undying ministry.

There is only one fair reaction against the partial and inadequate views of salvation which do not appeal to us, and that is not a reaction against salvation, but a reaction into the full, perfect, and sufficient view of it which Jesus had and which Paul so soon stated. What did Jesus mean by such words as "follow me," or "come along with me"? What did he mean by "leaving all," by being "born again"? What do such words as these mean: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God," "I am come that they might have life," "having Christ formed in you," "putting off the old man and putting on the new man" which is Christ Jesus? What is the whole creation groaning and travailing to produce? Surely, the whole spiritual universe would not make so much effort or suffer so much pain just to produce some of the results called salvation. What must you think of this sentence as Moffatt translates it?—"There is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ; what is old is gone; the new has come." All that seems to me to tie itself into the true conception of evangelism and to look like a pretty large conception of salva-

tion. "Salvation has far too largely been identified with single features of it, with forgiveness of sins, with a beginning called conversion. It has not been thought of as the supreme spiritual achievement in a person and at last in society through a new and perfect relation and adjustment to God through Jesus Christ" (McIntosh). With many men religion begins by being an emotion to be enjoyed. With some it remains that. But at its best it goes on to be a truth to be known, a conflict to be won, a cause to be lived for, an order to be established, a Christlike character to be achieved, a kingdom to be secured on earth. And if any man in the modern ministry wants a real task, wants to put his large ability to a worthy undertaking, wants to stretch his ability as far as it will stretch, let him walk up beside Saint Paul and go to "saving some" after this manner.

Back there a half hour ago I asked certain questions not meaning to answer them in detail, but asking them for the purpose of bringing out clearly the necessity of enlarging our conception of salvation in order to bring it to its true place in our thoughts and ministries. It would be pure presumption for anyone to attempt even with much fuller time to say perfectly all that salvation meant to Jesus, all that he meant to do, all that he means to do in a man and in the world. But the questions had to be raised. If

saving some is going to appeal in any adequate and imperial way to modern men, with modern views of life and society, it must appeal to them as a vastly larger thing than it has often seemed to be. I know no way to get the large view which is so sure and certain as to get Christ's view. And I am not at all afraid to have his total view brought forward in the light of modern psychology, modern social and political theory, modern racial understanding, and modern thinking as affected by our newer knowledge of other religions than Christianity. I fear for the fate of this supreme conception only when it is held in a small and partial way, or when a small interpretation of it is attempted in an atmosphere that is absolutely hostile to a small interpretation. We can save Christ's truth about salvation as a living, winning, conquering force in our world only by holding it and using it according to its length and breadth and depth and height as he himself did and does. We must go the whole length with him or we do not go anywhere. "One of the deepest of all our evangelistic tasks to-day is to save Christendom itself to a full acceptance of and loyalty to Christ and his principles."

Now in these closing moments I want to say a dozen words, still with those questions in mind, still thinking of the special subject before us, but still not meaning to attempt an answer to the

questions I have already asked. All the time we have to hold in mind the complex character of that human nature, those human personalities whom in Christ's name we seek to save. They were not all alike in his time. They are not all alike in our time. There is a way of reading the gospel story that throws into the foreground the weak, the outcast, the unattractive, what Sam Hadley called "the bums." The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that comes to such as these in particular is a dazzling, radiant glory that could come only from the heart of a loving God. I felt that in an overwhelming way after my first few days in India some years ago. I was disappointed at first that there were so few converts from the so-called upper classes, the scholars, the leaders and the rulers. Then came the vision of the grace of Christ to those millions of outcasts, the untouchables who had no grace in their history or their lives, and when that vision came I thanked God with a shout for a religion that gave these people a chance for life and love. It would be a sad day for the Church of Christ if it ever took any attitude to such as these other than Christ's attitude. But it would be an equally sad day if it brought to *them* only a partial salvation, and failed to relate them and all others to the larger passion of Christ. And it would be a sad day if it looked only to the universities and the favored classes

for its kingdom builders. We do not get all our material for the kingdom nor all our builders of the kingdom out of the colleges or the so-called upper classes or out of any classes. But whether our work is in one class or another, the class emphasis should never be made. In the end a saved humanity would not make class distinctions. Only the human emphasis concerns us, and that concerns us both for the individual human and for his place in the kingdom. A lot of people in every class are saved with large class limitations and reservations, with large unredeemed areas in their lives. Many of every race are saved with racial limitations or with a full retention of race and other prejudices. The churches are full of people saved in a most partial way, without any conception of what Jesus meant by salvation or by the kingdom. The church has been so anxious for recruits, so eager to bring people to its fellowship for their good and its own, that it has made salvation much more a purely personal thing than Jesus ever made it, and made it very much easier than he ever intended it should be made. Take a single sentence: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." What will your congregation think if you announce that text next Sunday? Will they not expect you to treat these clear words as more or less figurative? Why do we assume that figures mean

less than they say? And why do we so habitually take only the first step in the saving process?

Take, hurriedly, another matter. Why are we so complacent about making a Christian community or a Christian nation? Is it because we do not know the great words of Jesus as they bear upon nations and races, or because we think he did not mean what he said, or that what he said is impossible? We do not think of making a Christian community as included in Saint Paul's talk about "saving some." We think in terms of individual salvation. Do you expect Berkeley or Atlanta to be saved to Christ's ideals, Christ's ethics, Christ's ways of thinking, Christ's attitude to the world near and far? Or San Francisco? Or do you regard San Francisco and Chicago and New York as hopeless? Maybe they have too many Jews and foreigners of all sorts in them! All we can reasonably hope to do is to save some of our own folks. We are only expected to go to the Gentiles and not to all of them. Can we really look for a saved California, or Georgia? Have you any real and definite idea of a saved commonwealth, saved from its corporate wrong, its corporate selfishness, saved to the kind of thing a saved state could be and do to its citizens and to the world? Or saved universities? What sort of mind are we trying to make in the universities? Have we any idea of a passionate, prolonged, unweary-

ing endeavor to make the mind of the universities according to the mind of Christ, for the things of Christ, for the plans of Christ? We do not hesitate at all to talk and think of an American mind, or a California mind, or a Southern mind, or an Anglo-Saxon mind, or a Negro mind. Why are we so shy on the question of making in our near, immediate world the mind of Christ? *Is* it here? Does it seem to be anywhere near here?

The kingdom is always in his mind. It must be made somewhere or his dream and desire for the world utterly fail. It will not come to end the world, but to make the kind of world he wants men to have and live in. Once he said it was at hand, and at once goodness began to get a chance, to walk through the streets. Is it at hand here? Where do you expect it to come first? Anywhere, anytime, or just vaguely somewhere, sometime? Among what classes, in what groups, in what races, in what realms of life? Do you want it? Doctrinal questions about dates and times seem rather petty and impertinent here. We will not ask them.

Of course we should be reasonable and not fanatical! Well, in that part of the world where I live we are nowhere near a large fanaticism either in our expectations, our desires, our practices, or in any other real feature of life.

In the matter of saving some we are not burst-

ing our minds or straining our spirits in the effort to think of salvation in Christ's terms or according to his large conception. We are still laying the whole stress of the gospel upon part of it, still asking men and women, young and old, to accept all the creeds that the ages have believed, not compelling any of them to deny themselves, take the cross into their lives and start out into life after him.

Can you drink the cup that he drinks? Can you be baptized with his baptism? I do not know where you will sit if you do. You probably will not care to sit anywhere. But those who drink the cup with Christ, and are baptized with his baptism are the only ones who will be sure to share with him his eternal passion to save some. And only those who share this passion of his are willing to drink his cup or be baptized with his baptism.

III. MEANS AND MOTIVES

LECTURE III

MEANS AND MOTIVES

THE announcement of this particular subject will probably lead to expectations that will not be realized. You may look now for a discussion of the how and why of this thing we are thinking of that will make the reason for it plain and the method of it so clear that it can easily be done. As if a thing like this could be easily done! As if *any* really great thing could be easily done! Saving some was not easy for Jesus and has never been easy for anyone else. The shallow reason and the easy method are the deadly blights that destroy the souls of ministers and utterly prevent any deep and Christlike work in the world. I have not come to open before you ministers and candidates for the ministry a "bag of pretty evangelistic tricks" that will enable you now or any time to do with ease what never has been done without effort, what would not be worth doing if it could be done easily. Most of the methods with which we are familiar are methods of getting people started, getting them to begin a life that only after long ages will reach completeness.

Making Christianity easy is a disease in mod-

ern thought and church life. Obliterating the distinction between following Christ and being a moderately good man destroys the very roots of moral and religious life. If this thing in any phase or at any stage of it were easy, we would know that it was not according to Christ. You cannot substitute glib reasons for vital motives, nor cheap methods for a genuine passion. We can sit down with a set of ready reasons or a nice set of showy methods and flatter ourselves that we are comfortably well off, equipped with a suitable outfit for our task. But if when we get into that state of mind we look around for the Master of the difficult task, we shall discover that we are nowhere near him. He never found a place where a shallow motive or a superficial method would be any good or get him ahead one inch. I read a story the other day of a man who said he had seen a Quaker swimming in the Thames. When asked how he knew the man was a Quaker, he replied, "Because he was swimming against the current instead of floating with it." In other words, he was not taking the line of least resistance. Whenever Christianity itself or its ministry does take things easily, it ceases to wrestle even with the weak things of the world.

Now, let us look for a little at this question of means that Saint Paul had in his mind. We are always in danger of confusing means and ends,

and of spending our strength saving means or methods which in fact exist only for the ends to which they lead. We need, therefore, to make very clear to our own minds the distinction between means and ends in our Christian life and work. And we need also to get a large and comprehensive view of what we have in mind when we use the term "means." It does not seem in this letter to the Corinthians or anywhere else in the New Testament to signify the same thing as methods. It seems to go very much deeper than that word, down into essential principles. Many men think they can win men if they have certain familiar methods in their control. You may be expecting and desiring me to outline the methods that have seemed most successful, which I have already described as methods of getting people started, which is absolutely essential. This, however, is not my purpose. I really seek to get further down into our subject than that. I do not want to make a false or artificial distinction between means and methods, but only to keep entirely away from the surface of both terms.

1. First, then, this business of means seems to me a matter of real and genuine understanding. And the first element of that seems to be a real understanding of people. People are not all alike. Long ago Josh Billings said that a school-teacher must never forget that every pupil

was a "bile" of a different kind and requires a different kind of an educational poultice to bring him to a head. When people use the easy catchwords about "human nature being pretty much the same everywhere and all the time," or the coarse and unworthy statement that "all coons look alike" to them, you know that they are not thinking seriously. They are just treating a profound subject in a shallow and superficial manner. No minister of Christ is fit to minister in Christ's name to a mixed congregation if he knows only one type of people and knows them only in a partial way. There are men in the ministry this day, thousands of them, who do not know at all what has happened to the human race, to religion, or to young people in the last dozen years. The war has made no impression on them except that it was an awful disturbance. They go on as though nothing had happened. The British reports show that "four fifths of the young manhood of the country have little or no vital connection with any of the churches." The American reports declare that "definite believers are a small minority." On both sides the sea and among young men of all conditions and classes the church simply does not count in any real and vital way. I know, of course, that you have some fine young people in your churches. But there is not a town in California, Georgia, or Maryland that has nearly

as many young people in the churches as can be found outside.

And if you are to save them, you must understand the basis of that chasm between old and young. At present, in most places, the old people want the young ones, but they want them only on an elderly basis. And the tragedy of it all is that the church that is set to save all these groups has such a partial and meager, shallow and inadequate understanding of the very people the church is set to save in Christ's stead. And it is no use to lose our tempers and begin to abuse the present generation, to call the old ones fogies and the young ones flappers; no use to rail against our present degeneracy and to vaporize about the good old times. There were no good old times except in imagination. Nor is it any use to cry out for the old ways, the old paths, the old methods. They simply do not work. They never did. The world has not been won to Christ by any means that ever have been used. If what has been done is the best that can be done, let us thank God for so much, but utterly put away boasting. And especially let us put away our vain complacency about the future. The old motives will not now bear the strain of life. They never did. It is the sad, tragic pathos of human history that religion has meant so little to human life when it is meant to mean so much. Inherited wealth will not bear the

strain of modern business. Inherited houses will not bear the strain that modern domestic life puts on them. Inherited vehicles will not bear the strain of modern travel. No more will the inherited means of winning the world to Christ bear the strain of modern life, modern society, modern knowledge, and all the rest. But they never did bear that strain. We talk of revivals that moved whole communities and transformed entire towns, but, with an overwhelming gratitude for what they did do, let us face the fact that they never did do what Christ had in his mind when he told us to pray for the coming of the Kingdom. It never came anywhere.

2. The second feature of this required understanding necessary as a means of saving some is the understanding of what we mean by religion and by getting religion. Yesterday's lecture breaks in here again, but that will not hurt. We shall not get our idea any too clearly in our heads no matter how hard we try. Suppose you were asked to tell a plain man from the hills what religion is, or what Christianity is; or to tell him what it means to get religion and particularly what it means to get the Christian religion. You would run straight into that psychological fact that we think we understand the words that we commonly use. Whereas the philosophers and theologians have been for centuries trying to define and interpret religion. And about as hard

a study as there is lies in the question, "What is Christianity?" Let Harnack's and other attempts to answer illustrate it. It is easy, of course, to give a partial and imperfect answer, or to answer in terms of a phase of religion or an aspect of religious life or to repeat glibly a familiar phrase. And religion has suffered through the centuries, Christianity is suffering to-day everywhere from our habit of identifying the large thing with a small part of it, "laying the whole stress of religion upon one part of it."

Let me illustrate by the use of a familiar sentence often on preachers' lips, especially on their lips when they are in their most evangelistic mood. "Get right with God" is the appeal made with zeal and a burning heart. Under it a man faces about, repents, believes, has his sins forgiven, is born again according to the promise and becomes a new creature. Look fairly and steadily now at what has happened. It is important and significant enough to set the angels in heaven to rejoicing. Never let anyone put a low estimate upon the transaction that then takes place between the Redeemer and a human soul. But let no one either imagine that this is something which it is not at all. At its best it is the beginning of getting religion, or a start in the process of becoming a Christian man. At this point one is a babe in Christ. He has begun to be saved, started to become a man in Christ. But the

process of getting religion is not complete when it has only begun. I wonder if Saint Paul thought at all of the relation between the words "that I may save some," with his other words, sober, overwhelming words: "This is the Christ we proclaim; we train everyone and teach everyone the full scope of this knowledge, in order to set everyone before God mature in Christ; I labor for that end, striving for it with the divine energy which is a power within me" (Col. 1. 28, 29).

Have you seen or known anyone that answers to this high standard? A careful student has said: "In Jesus himself appears the vision of the perfect person, in his picture of the Kingdom appears the image of the perfect world" (Cross). Salvation is not accomplished until men are renewed in that personal image and the world made over into a kingdom of Christ.

Religion has no intellectual hold at all upon a lot of men, and precious little moral or ethical hold. All it has is a mild emotional hold on them. When the soldiers were asked about the qualities they thought a religious man ought to have they agreed in both Great Britain and America in just about this list: "Courage, unselfishness, generosity, practical kindness, sincerity, cheerfulness, straightforwardness, loyalty, single-minded honesty, persistence in trying to do the right thing." These words mean about the

same thing as Saint Paul's list of the fruit of the Spirit. But this brings us back to our words about "getting right with God" and puts into those words a wealth of meaning that is not put into them once in ten thousand times. When, therefore, you use those easy, catchy words, you cheat the whole process if you let the blight of smallness, imperfection of ideal, and nearness of goal fall upon them. Getting right with God means and must mean at last and at first "the creation of moral qualities in man like the moral qualities in God, the response of moral qualities in man to the moral qualities in God, the correspondence of moral nature between man the product and God the source."[1] How far this seems from the cheap, easy talk so often associated with those deep words! Getting religion ought never again to look like a small, partial process. We ought never again to confuse it simply with its beginning in experience or with a part of it in character. Somehow or other if we are going to save religion at all, we have got to give it its full, real meaning in human life.

Or take the other major term in this familiar sentence, the term "God." The God I was often exhorted to get right with more than a half century ago was an angry, avenging God, after me

[1] *Philosophy of Christian Experience,* Henry W. Clark, p. 37. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

with scourges and whips, threatening me with fires and stifling chemicals. And in thousands of Christian pulpits to-day God is still being interpreted in mediæval, cruel terms. A recent book from an American theologian declares that it is distressing to men who have thought deeply upon the foundations of the Christian faith to hear the words "the Christlike God."[2] But if we are not to get right with that kind of a God, a God who is like Jesus Christ in personal character, then for myself I have no God to get right with at all. And unless we are prepared to go the whole length with Jesus Christ in what he said about God, I do not see that we can go any length with him in the idea of salvation or redemption or anything else.

"Getting religion," then, as you see, is rather a serious thing. It means a good deal more than just getting partly right with any sort of God.

3. This process of saving some is also, in the heart of it, a method of understanding Christ and Christianity.

Remember that we are not trying to make a contribution to systematic theology, but to find a better way for our purposes and work as ministers of Jesus Christ. And practically we find that we must distinguish between Christianity

[2]In face of that statement from one writer, I must express my deep and sincere gratitude for Bishop Francis J. McConnell's volume, *The Christlike God.*

as a system of doctrine and Christianity as a divine power for human salvation and life; between Jesus Christ as a teacher of important truth and Jesus Christ as the user of truth for the redemption and development of men. Practically we take living, saving truths and harden them into formulas and doctrines about themselves. I cannot take the time here to go over again what has been said again and again in these simple addresses, but I cannot omit to try again to say how far I think our present low state in the Christian Church is due to the fact that we are so largely off the true center in our understanding of Jesus Christ and our preaching of him. I have no interest in old theology or new theology as such, but I have a burning desire that the men who hold both or either shall get to the true center of what Christ and Christianity mean to God and this broken world. If the truth of the living Christ means anything at all, it means something vastly more vital than a thing that can exhaust itself in a formal doctrine of the unchangeable Christ. I desire to speak respectfully and with becoming restraint, but it seems to me that vast tracts of both conservative and progressive theology, countless sermons, spoken and printed, need to be evangelized according to Christ's own idea and purpose.

4. In the next place this matter of saving some depends upon a method of interpretation.

A true interpreter is a genuine mediator. He is related both ways. He is between two persons not to separate them but to mediate them into fellowship. He is between a truth that he knows and loves and a man whom he knows and loves, not to keep them apart but to bring the truth and the men together so that the truth may set the man free and the man may go forward to be a mature man in Christ. Brooks was only partly right in his great conception of preaching as the utterance of truth through personality. It is really the bringing of truth through personality *to* personality. The true teacher is a true interpreter in this deep sense. And his supreme satisfaction lies not just in throwing his truth out for whatever fate may happen to it, but in mediating it through his own personality to other personalities. The saddest experience of a teacher is to see a saving truth and a needy personality each living alone. The truth gets no chance and the man no vision. I think the Great Teacher must have choked when he said "some of it fell by the wayside," or when he said that blind eyes, dull ears, and fat hearts kept the truth from doing what it could do in a man.

I have been studying preachers and churches through many years now and am fully persuaded that their ways of using their truth are much more vital in actual life than the truths they

hold. The truth a minister or church holds is important. Neither falsehoods nor half-truths will answer for their holy tasks. But the way they hold their truth, very often the way they use it, is enough to start the wounds of Christ to bleeding again. Preachers and churches would be amazed to discover how little of their truth they use for "saving some" or how little they hold in a saving way. They might be amazed to see how much of their truth could not be used for redemptive purposes at all. Dr. Hiram Corson, of Cornell, one Sunday said to a friend in Ithaca that he had "been over to the church on the next block listening to the glad tidings of damnation." But think for a moment how much of our truth we use just for purposes of argument, or for useful purposes of instruction, or for vulgar purposes of display or entertainment, or for purely oratorical purposes, or for the purpose of showing our orthodoxy and some one else's fatal heresy. Or think how much of our actual saving truth, our really redemptive message, is held and used in utterly unsaving ways. Indeed, many men hold meetings and use mechanical *methods* to save people but do not hold or use their *truth* to save people at all.

Men get interested in the subjects of their preaching and forget their objects. We older men were brought up on Austin Phelps' definition of a sermon and have never been at our best except

when we have been true to it: "A sermon is an oral address upon religious truth, as contained in the Scriptures, elaborately treated *with a view to persuasion.*" And it all climaxes in that as to all the use of our truth, the use of art, the use of music, the use of ritual, the use of learning, the use of theology, the use of the Bible, all "with a view to persuasion." It is all that we may save some and present them mature in Jesus Christ. You can work a wide area with this use of truth as a center, but you cannot go anywhere worth going from any other center. I know no way to save the church of to-day from the ruck of its miserable controversy and ordinariness except to get it back to the center where it will hold its truth and use its truth with the redemptive emphasis, the redemptive purpose, and the redemptive passion.

I do not wonder at all that we fail to walk clear up to these heights. This is the most difficult use of truth. It is far easier to exhibit a truth, or carry on an exposition for its own value, or argue for a doctrine, than to use our truth for the immediate or the constant saving of some. It is really easier to save truth itself than to save men by the truth. We find it hard to live up to our best visions, hard to keep what is central and primary in its own place. We can handle a secondary thing, especially if it is useful and valuable, much more easily. But there is

where we lose; lose by our conformity to the ordinary and conventional; lose by our utter lack of spiritual heroism and moral genius and daring, lose by our failure to "use the utmost for the highest." A recent book speaks of "the moral heat of the earliest Christians," and we do not seem to find anything quite like it in the church as a whole to-day. Doctrinal heat, which abounds at this time, does not seem like quite the same thing.

I wish I could say this now as it ought to be said. Maybe all I can do is to suggest it so that someone else will work it out: I mean the interpretation of Jesus Christ and the truth as it is in Jesus Christ in this nobly saving way. The very figures we use often get like a smoke screen before his face or before the faces of our hearers. The Old Testament and the New are full of terms that had deep and profound meaning to Jews and Orientals, and to men of that earlier day. The meaning abides through the centuries, for the meaning was rooted in reality. But the terms do not all abide in meaning at all. A true preacher bent upon getting to a modern group in California or Georgia must get through those ancient terms to the living truth and bring out that living truth in language his own people are familiar with. Henry Ward Beecher once said that if the twenty-third Psalm had been written in Kentucky it would have mentioned "bluegrass pas-

tures." The Jews came to Jesus over the Jewish road. It was the only road they knew. But using whatever Jewish experience will help, a modern American will come over his own road, by way of his non-Jewish history, by way of his Pilgrim or Puritan experience, his Southern or Western experience, to the living Christ. We may use but we must not be slaves to Saint Paul's phrases so as to miss his deep meaning. The law was a schoolmaster to bring the Jews to Christ as philosophy was for the Greeks, but Christ is now here and our access to him is direct and immediate, from our own background and experience.

But what I am perhaps vainly trying to say is that "saving some" involves a method of interpreting Christ as the Redeemer of life in a way that has not been seen in the Christian Church as it ought. Rules and principles for the interpretation of the Scriptures are well known. They are in many volumes and constitute a real part of every educated minister's training. But principles for the interpretation of the living Christ to living men have had no such study and no such emphasis. It is far easier to make an unanswerable sermon on the deity of Jesus Christ, with proofs and arguments that cannot be shaken, than to interpret Jesus Christ to a crowd of scholars, a crowd of children, a crowd of unlettered people, so that they will be drawn di-

rectly to him as he is. Here, I think, is where preaching Christ gets its meaning.

5. And this undertaking to save some by all means and at any cost will also involve and necessitate an inerpretation of the real place and the real use of the Holy Spirit in modern life. I know the instant reaction in many minds when the Holy Spirit is mentioned. Some think that the speaker who talks of the Holy Spirit may be an especially spiritual or pious man. Some others immediately fear when a man begins to talk of the Holy Spirit that he is about to spoil everything by extravagance or fanaticism. One group among us is always crying "Back to Christ," and "Nothing but Jesus," and "On with Christ," or "Let us make enough of Christ." Another group expects nothing to happen except repeated disaster until Christ comes again. We make our attitude toward Christ the test of our orthodoxy, the language we use about him the basis of our classification in doctrinal camps, and the manner of our mention of him the proof of our piety. We make a lot of God in Christ but nowhere near so much of God in the Spirit. And maybe our present plight in both life and doctrine is largely due to our failure to see the place of the present God, the Holy Spirit, in modern life. Maybe this is particularly the weakness of the modern church in this supreme business of "saving some." Everybody approved Glover's statement which is

quoted more than once in these studies that "speaking bluntly, the Christian Church is not making enough of Jesus Christ." We shall never bring the Kingdom until we do make enough of him. But is it not just as true that, speaking bluntly, the Christian Church is not making enough of the Holy Spirit? Have we not all too largely left the making of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to the mystics and the use of the Holy Spirit to the spiritual extremists, not to say the religious fanatics? Have we ever gone in practice and teaching, in use and experience, the whole length of what we say we believe? Professor Josiah Royce says: "The article of the Creed regarding the Holy Spirit is, I believe, the one matter about which most who discuss the problem of Christianity have least to say in the way of definite theory. Yet, if I am right, this is, in many respects, the really distinctive and therefore the capital article of the Christian creed, so far as that creed suggests a theory of the divine nature." Frederick Dennison Maurice said long ago: "I cannot but think that the reformation in our day, which I expect to be more deep and searching than that of the sixteenth century, will turn upon the Spirit's presence and life, as that did upon justification by the Son." And another has said: "We never can tell when the church is going to break out into new life."

And all this, I think, bears especially upon what we are thinking of in these studies. If I were a theologian, I would like to state the doctrine of the Holy Spirit so that that doctrine would become fruitful and life-giving to the church; so that it would neither run ahead of the other living truths of God and human experience, nor lag behind them; so that it would not be left to the specialists or extremists who are always "laying the whole stress of religion upon one part of it." I am not a theologian and am bringing this subject forward here because I cannot see how the church can bring out its truth into a new life of spiritual power, power to redeem the world, except in the power of the Spirit. And those pastors, shepherds of the flock of Christ, who are determined by his grace to save some, must, it seems to me, in a new and large way, in a modern, rational, universal way, interpret the real place and the real use of the Holy Spirit in the modern world. Nothing else or less than this will make sure in the modern world that perfect work of Christ, that perfect use of his truth, that conformity to his character, which will make men feel again that he lives and his kingdom is near.

6. In the next place, this divine business of saving some becomes a matter of personal revelation.

When will we learn, do you think, that God's

method was the only method for him and that its principle is the only method for us? He spoke his message at various times and in various ways. He used several methods with the prophets. But at the last the word of redemption had to become a revelation, had to be spoken in a person. Every deep, personal truth must finally find utterance in a personal life. All our best revelations in these vital concerns, these concerns of life, must be made at last in personality. James Martineau once said that "Jesus Christ shows us in a living definition what a Christian ought to be." The English journalist Gardiner says of a recent Archbishop of Canterbury that "he was an embodied office." Saint Paul called the Corinthians living epistles. Jesus called himself the way, the truth and the life. And one day when he entered a publican's house he said: "This day is salvation come to this house." A traveler in the Holy Land greeted a shepherd standing at the entrance to his fold and asked him where the door was, and the simple man replied in the Master's own terms, "I am the door." By him the sheep came in and went out. It all comes to the same thing, the revelation through a personality. I wish I could say this so that the truth as it is in Jesus Christ and nowhere else except in him should be clear and convincing to you.

Suppose the idea of saving some had never

been revealed in a person at all. Suppose it had always remained just a statement. Suppose it had never been anything but a verbal message from God. Suppose he had never gone beyond telling prophets and apostles what to say about it. Suppose we had been blessed only with a set of perfect phrases and exact definitions, statements of law, doctrinal formulas, rituals and sacraments. One can only guess how far we would have gone or come, but it would not have been far. All history shows us that. At last the word had to become a Person and live among us, so that we could see it full of grace and truth. You cannot state the content of the gospel of salvation in a phrase, however careful and exact. That can be stated only in a Person and revealed in a life. I have no intention of using that foolish statement that you are to be "small Christs," but I am trying to say that this chief business of your ministries becomes at last a matter of personal revelation. In all too many towns in the East and West, the South and the North it has been only a matter of statement, of argument, of verbal appeal, of mechanical method, of all that we know so well in our observation and experience. And it has not been a personal revelation in any deep sense. I would not press the point of what Jesus said in the house of Zacchæus, but one cannot help being thrilled by the picture. "Salvation has entered this house."

Here it is, standing here alive, not a statement about it but the thing itself. Nor would I overpress another point that this suggests. Many a town learns after a time that when a minister of Christ comes to it a lot of fine things have come—scholarship, eloquence, courage, good manners, orthodoxy, zeal, organizing ability, and the like. But only once or twice have men said to me of a minister: "Salvation came to this town with that man and remained here with us in all its best meaning while he was here." Such ministers make clear its meaning and its place in life and they make a spirit for it, a spirit in which it can begin and in which it can go on until men are matured in Christ.

I know how imperfect is this discussion as to method. You might have preferred a detailed statement as to the various ways in which the work of saving some can best be done. *Most of them relate to the ways in which it can be started or begun.* I am thinking of a far deeper, broader thing than the mechanics of the most spiritual, the most intellectual, the most ethical process with which a minister has to do. He may be doing a score of useful, praiseworthy things, but if he is not saving some all the time and in every way, he is not at the center of his ministry. For the center of a true ministry is the place where Jesus Christ the Saviour lives and works.

I have left myself hardly any time to speak of motives. But that is not disturbing at all, since that discussion reaches right over into the next study, motives being the bond that ties methods and cost together. Perhaps I can begin what I want to say about motives by repeating what President Tucker of Dartmouth College said to me with intense emphasis one autumn day as we walked over the hills in New Hampshire after a service in the college church. The preacher had been speaking of motives, deploring the fact that so many of them are mixed and so many of them small. He had been comparing the motives of men, his own included, with the motives of Jesus in these two particulars, quality and size. It had not been a very comfortable sermon either for the preacher or the audience. There was a rather intense light evidently shining from somewhere near the throne of light, into the motives of us all. And as we two men walked together in silence for a while the president turned to the preacher and said almost fiercely: "Next to the tragedy caused by sin in men's lives is the early loss of motive power in them." He was thinking of the lack of size in the motives that drive men, of the machinery of life that is too big for the power of life, as it probably has always been, and of power that soon becomes exhausted.

We have been careful enough to insist that

motives should be pure and worthy, but not equally careful to see that they should be large and powerful, capable and enduring. All the little motives of life, no matter how pure they are, break down or give out sooner or later under the burden and strain of life. Nowhere is this truer than in this supreme business of life, the business of saving some. It does not matter whether we think of our small local conditions or our large, social, missionary, world conditions, small motives are exhausted early, worn out long before the work is done. It has been so throughout all Christian history. It is so to-day. We do not need to go into them, the denominational motive for saving people, the motive that even squints toward increasing the social prestige or the financial strength of the church, the statistical motive that looks toward swollen numbers, the vulgar commercial motive or the equally vulgar motive that regards the personal reputation to be won for the evangelist, a reputation that can be still further capitalized—they are all petty and unworthy, all broken down and discredited in the thought of serious men.

But the sad thing is that so many of those very best men have had this reaction against what they see to be small and unworthy and have pretty nearly turned against the thing itself. They do not seem to see that the cause of Christ

in his purpose for humanity suffers irreparably when the largest feature of it is in the hands of the smallest men, when the dominant note is being sounded only by the minor players in the chorus and by them only in a small way. And unless we can recover for large groups of men, for large groups of large men who have so largely lost it, a motive large enough to drive *them* into and carry *them* through a lifetime of passionate, prolonged, unflagging effort to save some, I see no way by which all ministries can be saved for their best purposes in the world, or by which the heart of our unwearied Saviour can be kept from even deeper hurt than it now inevitably suffers. Men can be useful, popular, influential in many ways, and wholly respectable, but men cannot be imperial, or apostolic, or Christlike if their motives lack size and endurance, or driving and sustaining power. It took a big motive to bring the Saviour into this earthly world. It takes a big motive to keep him working ahead with this miserable and difficult world. Nothing small, no matter how pure and lovely, would have brought him in the beginning or would have carried him through the sober years or would carry him now through the deepened, enlarged struggle for the world's salvation. Sometimes one feature or phase of Christ's life moves me most, stirs me most deeply, sometimes another. But I never get over the wonder of his determination, his

unchanging purpose, his uncalculating devotion and effort to win through to the end. Glimpses of that make certain familiar words glow: "Having loved his own he loved them to the end." An English preacher the other day said: "Why is the cross the sheet-anchor of the human soul? It is because of the deep human belief that what Jesus has died for he means to have." Now, if you do not see this, there is no use for me to say it. If you do not see that the modern ministry can get the kind of motive it has got to have only by entering into the eternal, the unceasing, the overwhelming motive of Christ himself, by having it dominate and drive, sustain and lead us, it does not matter what else you do see, or what else I try to say.

And if we think that any motive smaller than this or other than this is going to make saving men of us, or make his church a saving church in the modern world, we blind and deceive ourselves. He did not get into this agelong world struggle just because it would be interesting or advantageous for men to have him do it. As Principal Forsyth put it: "He is not a convenience. He is a necessity." He knew it and knows it. That brought him, that carried him through to Calvary, that keeps him going as he thinks of and works in the whole, big, saving task that we have got to share with him in San Francisco, in Atlanta, in America, in the world.

And if we have not motives that are big enough to keep us going with him in this supreme purpose of his eternal life, then we are not close enough to him, nor anywhere near enough like him to be of much use. I do not forget that sentence in the telegram asking me to go to Berkeley—"Any subject vital to the modern ministry." And I cannot see that any subject is more vital to the modern ministry than the grasp of Christ's saving purpose in the world of to-day and the motive of Christ in the modern ministry as its living force. It was said of Job's friends that "they were great believers in unfelt truth." Their views broke down in the face of experience and life. The modern church has too large an interest in and too large a store of what the psychologists would call unmotivated doctrine. Only the motive of Christ the Redeemer will carry the truth of Christ into the life of the world for its salvation.

How can we get that big motive? Do we need to ask? We cannot get it by simply or even seriously looking at the size of our redemptive task, though we will not get it without doing that. The size of the task utterly overwhelms the men who look only at it. We cannot get it just by resolving that we will enlarge our motive, though we will not get it unless we do make that resolution. More ministers are dying in their power from lack of mighty resolution than you

can count. We get the Christlike quality and the Christlike size into life and motive only by becoming Christlike men and having him formed in us. And we know that process, the way that leads to that. We have got to go up with him. We have got to fill up that which is behind of his experiences. We have got to pay the price if we are to conquer and reign with him.

IV. MOTIVES AND COST

LECTURE IV

MOTIVES AND COST

Dr. James Dennis once said that "the evangelistic motive must dominate and control the evangelistic method." Motives are primary and creative. Methods can only express motives and give them practical usefulness. Emerson had this in mind, I fancy, when he said in substance that men do not ask what you do or how you do it half so much as they ask what makes you do it. I cannot rid myself of the fear that our saving activity and purpose have too largely broken down at their source in our motives. There are those who will insist that we shall not recover our saving passion except by the recovery of certain ancient theology. But it is just that ancient theology that seems to have become exhausted as a vital motive. And it never did save the world. Let us not forget our history. It had meaning for men in an older day, because they believed it to have come from the living fountain of the gospel and the Christ. I think we can recover a real, saving passion for our own lives only by a new contact of our own with Christ and a new, living understanding of his meaning for modern life. We may lose the faith of the early Christians and miss our own

power in the world by trying to save the phrases of some earlier age instead of trying to save the men of this age through the power of the living Christ, using our own phrases to tell what he means to us. For to-day, then, let us look a bit further into this matter of motives lying between the methods and cost of saving some.

1. Take, first, the motive for saving some as seen in Christ's idea of the meaning of salvation for life or in a man. He surely would not have paid such a fearful cost for any ordinary thing. We have made the idea common and so overlaid it with moderate meanings that it has lost its wonder for us. Really, one sometimes fears that the modern Christian does not regard the work of Christ in him as anything very remarkable. Maybe the ordinariness of our Christian experience has taken the thing itself out of the category of the marvelous. Maybe there are all too few graces and qualities in us that could have come there only by a supreme work of a person like Christ. It was not always so. Time was when men declared that certain things had not been heard of from the beginning of the world. Perhaps one of the steps in this new saving process will be to recover an acute consciousness within ourselves that Christ does do something to us and in us that only a divine Saviour could do. If that does happen, we shall make it known. At the first men simply had to tell it.

That is the way a rare experience still affects us. This thing that has happened is so marvelous, so beyond anything we ever thought of, so beyond anything we could produce in ourselves, that we marvel. We want to tell it. Then comes the slow wearing down of the wonder, the slow rubbing away of the bloom, the inevitable dulling of the edge of rapture, the final commonplace thinking about a thing that is not commonplace at all. And the whole glorious gift of God in Christ, the gift of Christ himself to us men becomes dull and mediocre and average. The sense of salvation in its wonder, its vitality, its expansion ceases to be vivid and acute. God does not count except once in a while, Jesus Christ only at Christmas, and then in a shallow fashion, and the Holy Spirit hardly at all. Modern Israel simply does not care or consider. And the church satisfies itself with its activities, its doctrinal correctness, its proprieties, its moderate increase, its indirect evangelism and its general usefulness. Not feeling very keenly and vividly the meaning of Christ to the life of men, it does not burn itself up to bring them together. And with its present vague idea of the meaning of salvation to a life, the bringing of a man to maturity in Christ, it has no motive that is at all adequate to keep it eternally at work. It needs a new discovery or a rediscovery of what salvation means to a man.

We are all too content when we produce a moderately good man. I think Jesus' sorrow over the rich young ruler was largely due to the fact that Jesus saw what that rare person might become if he would only let himself go, with all his possessions, the whole length with Jesus.

It comes back again to what we mean by salvation. And we cannot say too often or too clearly that only Christ's own view of that will answer. Suppose men are *not* thinking much about sin. Suppose they are thinking of themselves all too complacently. Here is the blazing fact, that no matter how decent they are, the best of them are far from Christlike in their purposes, spirit and ideals. And salvation is not at all complete until men are saved from their unChristlike lives and characters. We used to be asked what men were saved from. This is the answer: They are saved from unChristlikeness. And when the work is perfectly done, they are saved to a likeness to Christ in their purposes, ideals, spirit, and characters—in their lives, in short. And he thinks of it in those terms. That is what it means to Christ. His conception of it gives motive to the process.

2. Or consider, second, motives as seen in what saving some means to Christ himself. He evidently thought it meant something for a man to be brought back to God. He did not take it for granted or regard it as a mere convenience

or advantage. He never took a complacent view of men away from God or thought they were getting along pretty well apart from himself. You may say a hundred true things about Jesus, but you cannot say that he was complacent about or indifferent to men's spiritual life and welfare. The fires in his bones were never banked or allowed just to smolder so as to keep the fires from going out. He was on fire all the time and knew nothing of banked fires. The zeal of the Lord's house was eating him up all the time from Nazareth to Gethsemane and Calvary. It is easy for us to use the words "for Christ's sake" without thinking clear into them and without being moved at all by Christ's motives and purposes. All too often these words are just a handy phrase with which to close a prayer, or a pious phrase to throw over the meagerness and feebleness of our own motives and purposes. And the church will never fulfill Christ's purposes in the world until it takes his view of the world and personally shares his eternal passion for the world. It must see the meaning of saving some as he saw and sees it.

3. Or, third, consider the motive for saving some as seen in the vision of a saved race or a saved nation.

The Christian Church has never been fully possessed by a consuming and lasting passion for creating individual men who shall be mature

in Christ. Much less has it been concerned for a whole race complete in him, or for an entire civilization made according to his mind and spirit. It is doubtful now whether in any real, deep sense we are even thinking seriously of a saved race or a saved nation. But no careful student can read history without thinking pretty soberly what the Jewish race might have become if it had fulfilled the purposes of God instead of failing him in those purposes, if his own people had perfectly responded to Jesus when he came instead of rejecting him as they did. He wanted to save the Jews as a race and make of them a saving race. He would, they would not. And that was what made the nails hurt so when he was on the cross. And now there is no saved race or nation anywhere. And there is no saving race or nation anywhere; not the white race, or the brown or the yellow or the black; not the Jews, or the Negroes, or the Anglo-Saxons; and not Great Britain, or France, or Germany, or the United States. There simply is not one anywhere. And the worst of it is that nobody is even seriously thinking in those terms. We are not thinking of the United States becoming a saving nation in Paul's sense or in Christ's. We are thinking of it becoming rich and powerful, prosperous and strong. We are not thinking of the white race or the Negro race in the terms of a saving race. We are talking our heads off

about race relations, race friction, race privileges and rights, but not about race redemption and race salvation for the race's sake, for Christ's sake, and for the world's sake. And all our talk about race superiority and the rest is vain and unchristian in the white light of the cross and the desire of the Man on it.

But there is no saved or saving race, no saved or saving nation anywhere in the world. And Christianity is nearly twenty centuries old. And the Master must be very weary by now. This is no time to be thinking of petty methods or little motives. For motives lead straight into cost and we will not pay a big price for a cheap thing in Christian work or anywhere else. The Jews had their chance and turned aside from it. That is what makes their present place among men so pitiable. If they had gone with Jesus and not against him! Teach us, O God, to apply our hearts to wisdom!

And now we must try to find our way into the words "by all means" lying there in Saint Paul's letter. Indeed, I think the words are not lying there as if in quietness and composure at all. One of the translations makes them read, "at any cost." Probably, as a matter of fact, they mean more than can be put into any three words. Anyhow, we can see that the price one must pay for saving some goes far deeper into his life than any of the methods he uses. Jesus does not shed

much light upon the question of mechanical methods, but he lights all effort with radiance by the way he paid the full price for the thing he thought to be worth whatever it might cost. He evidently had no doubt about the value of a saved humanity. He would pay any price of service and sacrifice for that. The difference between him and the rich ruler was that one would pay the full price, would go the whole length at any cost, and the other would not.

I wonder if there is any other point at which the modern ministry more deeply needs insight and purpose than at this point of seeing and sharing the unreserved purpose of Jesus. We have tried quite too much to make our doctrines of his person and his work in an atmosphere of detachment rather than in the atmosphere in which he lived and lives. One can make a doctrine of the incarnation or form an intellectual theory of the atonement in a library. One may even make a doctrine that will be clear and consistent in its statements. But after all is said no minister truly comprehends either incarnation or atonement as life forces, as they are understood by Jesus, unless he is living and practicing them constantly. Christianity is not an easy religion nor a cheap one. A religion of redemption, a religion of incarnation and reconciliation, inevitably costs the Redeemer a tremendous price. It will cost his life at last and a lot of other

things that mean even more than life to a high-souled person. But if in the process of saving some he hesitates anywhere; if he goes to counting the cost, he will not pay the "full, perfect, and sufficient" price necessary. The words of Jesus on this subject must be read in the light of his own life. His words do not mean less than they say. Always the meaning is personally larger and deeper than the words themselves. The real distinction of Christianity is that it has a Saviour. And the test of Christianity's Saviour is that he will pay the full price to save. He will "save some" at any cost to himself. He will bend everything and adapt everything to the saving motive, he will shape everything to the saving method, and he will put into the process of salvation whatever is needed of life and power to save. If salvation were a narrow, small thing, as it is too often thought to be, it could be won by small effort, obtained at small cost. But this thing that Jesus Christ means to do in a man and in the world is not small nor shallow. That is why it costs him so much, why it must cost any modern man so much.

He will put his whole life into it. He will lay his life down, not simply at last on Calvary, but all the way up to Calvary, and will keep on "toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back." He knows that this cannot

be achieved without shedding his blood, not in any old legalistic sense, but in a real and living way. If he does not put his life's blood into it no one will get any life blood out of it.

There are men in the modern ministry with good methods for getting men started in the way of salvation, men who are willing to go some distance to get them started. And all that is well, but I hope you are not thinking of that as the whole of salvation. Recall the old statement about the essence of evolution: "The test of a thing is the question what it has in it the power to become." That initial experience which in many lives is so dramatic and so overwhelming must be tested by the way it works out in life. That Saviour of ours was not done with men just when they first came to him. He is never done with men. I never have seen a man yet who seemed to me to be a perfected product. In these personal ways and meanings certain words have deep and tremendous meaning. "Having loved his own he loved them to the end." "My Father works up to this very hour and I work." Many men begin well and easily grow weary in their efforts to save some. One of the tragedies of church life is the tragedy of the way we get impatient with material like Peter and throw it away on easy provocation.

We have to interpret the incarnation itself in the light of what "saving some" cost God him-

self. I think it has been and is important to have a right doctrine of the mystery of the incarnation. Theology is not a foolish thing in itself, in the real effort to understand and interpret the truths upon which religion lives and through which religion finds verbal statement. It matters much what men think and how they think it. But we are quite too prone to miss the personal element and to feel that we have the living truth when all we have is the verbal statement. The coming of God into our human life, the remaining of God in our human life with all that it meant and means represents the price God is eager to pay to save some. He seems even willing to pay the full price without requiring a guarantee that what he did would get all to be saved. Practically it looks as if he paid the full price for a partial result, as if in the outcome he did not get all that he had paid for. Nevertheless, for God as for ourselves, perfection of effort cannot be conditioned upon perfection of outcome. So while the theological understanding of the incarnation is important its moral understanding is absolutely essential.

President Coffin points out that Paul used the words "he emptied himself" not in a theoretical sense to explain or furnish the basis for a doctrine but in an intensely practical sense. The Philippian church was in a bad mood because some of the members were taking themselves too

seriously and making themselves self-important. And Paul appeals to the example of Jesus to destroy their ugly pride and self-assertion and to awaken in them a new spirit.[1] In other words, the only way to understand the incarnation or the atonement, or the life of Christ itself is to practice them, to go the whole length with him, the whole length in personally following him. There is an immense amount of orthodoxy just now, as there has always been, which is purely verbal. It says "Lord, Lord," and insists upon everybody saying it in the same accent, but it is not all of it so careful to do the things or to show the spirit of the incarnation in constant practice. For at the risk of being utterly tiresome I say again that the only way to understand the incarnation and all that went with it is to see it in the light of its full, large saving purpose and spirit. And that is a way of life and not a way of detached reasoning and mental insight.

3. The cost of saving some will involve bringing all our preaching, our conduct of public worship, and our pastoral ministry into perfect subjection and conformity to this deep motive and dominant note.

It would be easy to grow sarcastic and critical over a lot of methods with which we are familiar. That would add flavor and piquancy to this sober

[1] *The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the New Testament*, pp. 23-24.

speech, but I do not care for it. Nor, in fact, do you. We are not concerned about the mechanics of salvation. The very word annoys us. It does not sound like the kind of a word we could use in conversation with Jesus or Paul. It would seem trifling and impertinent. We must try to get deeper into the thing than that. Somehow Paul does not quite seem to have had mechanics in mind when he wrote those burning sentences about saving some. You recall the whole passage. Or suppose you stop here and reread it in the various translations, the American Revised Version, the *Twentieth Century New Testament,* Weymouth's *New Testament in Modern Speech,* Moffatt's *New Translation of the New Testament,* or Goodspeed's. No matter which one we read, it contains the kind of talk that sobers us and brings us up standing. It applies the acid test to all our methods and attitudes. This is not the language of a man who is thinking of cheap and superficial methods. If I had skill at paraphrasing, I would try to rewrite these sentences in words that would fit our ministries. The paraphrase might run like this:

I was not under anybody's control. Nobody had hired me. I was a free man in my local church and in my denomination. I was not even in subjugation to or fear of the local traditions, the traditions of a church and community that looked for culture and

order, good manners, and freedom from emotionalism and excitement. I was not dominated by a church or denomination that did not believe in conversions or by one that did not believe in anything else except conversions and revivals of a certain pattern. I was a free man, I tell you. I was the captain of my ministerial soul. And in this perfect freedom I became the bond servant of, put myself in slavery to the whole place, the whole crowd, the rich, the poor, the members of the faculty, the undergraduates, the fishermen, the Negroes, the Japanese, the Jews, the bankers, the reporters, the best people and the worst, in an effort to win just as many converts as possible. I did not ask where they came from. I was interested only in where I could get them to go; not in what they were, but what, in Christ, they might be. I believe in free speech. I believe in freedom of thought, but for me every thought is in captivity to Christ. No man takes my freedom from me. I can lay it down, I can take it again, I lay it all down that I may save some.

I have taken the Jewish viewpoint, hard as it is; the Japanese viewpoint, hard as that is; the Negro viewpoint, hard as that is; the Mohammedan viewpoint, which is hard as can be, so that I could get them to take Christ's view of life, accept Christ's principles for life, receive him for life. One of the hardest things I have had to do is to adjust myself to the incompetent. They are weak, but do not always know it. Sometimes, like that outcast woman that was at the well, they are disputatious and full of argument. It is hard to be patient with the weak when they are self-assertive, not so hard when they know their weakness, very hard when they have gone below the line of hope and self-respect. It strains a personality like mine, sensitive,

refined, trained, to go through all this. I wonder sometimes if it pays, if it would not be wiser for me just to write books and let the professional evangelists do this; they are used to people like these. I wonder if I ought not to go out rather exclusively for the better classes, the educated, those who are likely to be leaders. How did Jesus endure men like Peter and some of those others? Of course I see what enabled him to do what he did. He was not counting cost or considering taste or comfort. He was out at any cost to save some. He was doing everything for the sake of the gospel. That explains everything for him. That makes everything possible for him and maybe that will do it for me. He could not save himself. Others had tried that. It does not work. That plan and philosophy do not fit him. He must save others, as many as he can, all if possible. Anyhow, all must have the chance. I see where it is going to lead me, but I must go with him, now that I have seen him. This thing must not evaporate in words or exhaust itself in emotion. All things, at any cost, to all men, that *we* may save some. He does it. He lets me help. I must not fail. Someone may not get saved if I fail. He did not fail nor get discouraged. "All things, any cost, all men, save some."

"Jesus, I my cross have taken."

Now, let us go back again for a moment, to recall the conception of saving some that seemed to be fairly in the thought of Jesus and Paul. Remember how large we thought it had become, how we were not thinking of or satisfied with any of those small, partial ideas of salvation that small minds so readily grasp. We were

thinking of saving some as being equal to winning them over to Christ's view of life, to Christ's principles, to Christ's ideals of character, Christ's attitude to God on one hand and to evil on the other, Christ's philosophy of human conduct and relations, Christ's vision of the world and its redemption, making a personal character spiritual and ethical in itself and in its relations, according to the pattern of Christ. Why do we beat around the bush about this? We actually mean a new creature, whose goal is manhood in Christ. All this involves such a relation to Christ himself, such an acquaintance with him as to constitute a real Christian experience at once large in its scope and vital in its character. We did not try a definition since in these large matters definitions are somewhat in the nature of vanity and since we must constantly enlarge our definitions so that they may take in all new knowledge and all new conditions. But doing this was surely in the supreme purpose of Christ and in the controlling idea of Paul. You can see how it bears into everything else, how under this conception of salvation everything can be, everything must be filled with the saving motive.

Indeed, the saving motive is necessary to save other things from barrenness and futility. Take a few of the regions into which this runs. First: *the immediate region of preaching and public*

worship. What do they do for those who come to your church? How far does the sermon get them? How far do you mean it shall get them? How far do the Scriptures and prayers and hymns carry the members of your congregation? Many British writers both of books and articles are saying that most of the current preaching in Great Britain lacks the note of insistence, and the sense of pressure for immediate response to Christ for new life and all life; that it does not seem to feel that the condition of men without Christ is desperate and even tragic; that it appears to be too complacent with things as they are and people as they are; that the burning intensity of the great evangelists of history appears to be thought improper to modern men; that there is really no occasion for agonizing and urging as though Christ means life itself to a man. Heaven save us from thinking of this as though it were only a weakness of British preaching to-day. How I wish it were only a weakness of some other services than our own! So much preaching, so much ritual with which we are familiar seems so futile in the matter of bringing people to God and leading them to walk with him! Much of it does not even seem to try. The thing does not seem to have the big motive behind it.

The old story of Borrow has been revived recently. A company of gypsies followed him cry-

ing, "Give us God." He took some money from his pocket and gave them coins of various values. The gypsies threw the stuff back, crying, "We don't want your money; give us God." And many a congregation gets the small coins of small preaching, current debate, moral platitude, orderly or disorderly ritual, instead of the one thing it needs and in its heart wants. You can get people to come to you. You can get them to come again. Good music will do it. Certain kinds of eloquent speech will do it. Even good form will bring them for a while. But that only brings them to the rim, the outer gate, the suburbs, the environs of the life in Christ. The very language of worship is formal in the hands even of good men who have not the saving urgency in them. And that language, often stately, exalted, and tender, means nothing to people who have no great experiences of salvation for its interpretation. The language of salvation and worship can reach its full significance only in the hearts that know its meaning, who are being saved day by day. Why a ritual of beauty and splendor? That people may admire and enjoy it? That is vain temple treading in its modern form. All this is that some may be saved, that they may be brought to God and developed into likeness to Jesus. There are many kinds of ministries: "God grants some of us to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists,

some shepherds, some teachers, but it is all to the end that we all may attain to maturity and the full measure of development which belong to the fullness of Christ." But that is just another way of saying that big word "salvation." When that gets out of the central place in preaching or worship, everything goes wrong.

And the same thing is true of the use of doctrine, and that important movement so popular just now known as religious education. What is your experience with the theological controversy and with the official statements of the doctrines of your churches as evangelistic aids? Are the creed-making eras in Christian history eras in which large numbers are being brought to Christ for salvation? Are such periods usually followed by immediately enlarged activity on the part of the churches to "save some"? And yet, do you not think, creeds ought to be made and doctrines stated in such terms and in such spirit as to prove a real help to men who are all the time engaged in the direct hand-to-hand business that Paul had in his mind? Surely, sound doctrines can have only one real end and one highest purpose—to lead men to Christ for salvation and on with Christ in the saved life. In point of fact, do they do that? I am not raising the question at all as to the truth they contain, not inquiring whether they are true or not. This is not a study in the doctrinal correctness

of any of the creeds, elaborate or simple. My purpose is not theological, certainly not controversial, but is wholly evangelistic. Is the average creed in its usual form an assistance in persuading young people to begin the life with Christ or is it more often one of your practical difficulties? Are our creeds made to express the basis of a start in the Christian life or are they made to express the mature and developed views that scholarly men come to hold in the ripened experience of life? Take the bulk of your work in this business of saving some, which must be done with children, with young people, with common men and women untrained in philosophy or theology, that supreme business of bringing them to Christ's ideals, his principles, his spirit, his purposes, to Christ himself for all that we mean by the enlarged conception of salvation upon which we are working, how much use do you make, or can you make, or ought you to make of the historic creed of your church? Some of you will remember Bruce's study of Saint Mark, called by the happy title, *With Open Face*. The closing chapter contained what he called "The Christian Primer," which was prepared "to help children see Jesus with open face." Nobody will for a minute misunderstand me in this matter. I am not making a doctrinal comment, much less a doctrinal assault upon the historic creeds or confessions in use in

all our churches. I have accepted and do accept the doctrinal statements held by our church, but when I came into the church as a boy they did not mean much to me. Then I only wanted to be good, to follow Christ and to be a member of the church as a means to a better and more useful life. I am only raising these questions now in view of our other, our special purpose, which is to get our Christian truth at work in making the path to Christ straight and open, and the way on with him real and alluring. There is too much big ability now being used in the saving of doctrines of one brand or another, and not nearly enough effort to use the truth of Christ and present Christ himself so they shall do their highest work which always is to set men free and make them complete at last. Our emphasis ought not be upon the thing that has made whole centuries of Christian history dry as a desert. Our emphasis ought to be upon using the saving truth of Christ so that it will help to do the saving work of Christ. Maybe creed making ought to be evangelized! One of the big missionary documents recently declared that Christianity could save the world if Christianity were to get saved.

This idea also runs straight into that movement now running so strong and full in our churches, *the movement of religious education.* As a science it has not got very far yet in the

churches. It will go very much further, as it ought and must. It is so good that it must not be allowed to go wrong or fail to reach its largest use. It can come to its kingdom only by being filled with the saving purpose, the saving spirit, and the saving passion. To what end does one learn certain facts, if not for life's sake? Religious education will become utterly barren, will develop into a modern humanism unless it is filled with the saving passion. Religious experience runs into wild and dangerous fanaticisms unless instructed and led by sound instruction. The one is not a substitute for the other. Each is necessary to the other. Here again we touch that question of youth, our chief field for evangelistic hope and endeavor. False views of salvation will make no appeal to the best of them. Narrow and unreal, shallow and selfish theories of the religious life they will scornfully reject and pass by. They will not sacrifice their growing minds to claims which crucify their intelligence. They are our most hopeful field. They will respond to spiritual and intellectual reality. Religion has got to grip the whole person with reality. It has got to seem vital enough to follow. Youth has declared over and over that it wants reality and sincerity. It sees these things in Jesus Christ. It does not see them in a lot of other things claiming his support and authority. And religious education gives us our

new, modern, *evangelistic* opportunity. We have seen often the evangelistic value of emotion and other kinds of appeal. We have never seen nor made half enough of the evangelistic value, the saving value of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. The new psychology is in the center of the stage. The church as a saving body lost in its power to save by its attitude to the new astronomy, and later by its attitude to the new geology and biology. But here in psychology it ought to be at home. Here is where religious experience centers and exists. But the new psychology will run away from the church or run away with it unless the saving passion of Christ fills and rules the movement called religious education. It is said sadly that the old methods are no longer possible. But it ought to be said triumphantly that the new method surpasses anything that the Christian centuries have seen.

Here is where we come to the real test of the uses of truth. With Jesus and with all those who take his view of truth and life, truth is for life's sake. We ministers of his have no right just to an æsthetic possession of truth, nor a theological, nor a philosophical, nor a scientific, nor a professional possession of it. We have no right to truth at all except for saving purposes. Men set up to be teachers, or to be theologians, or directors of religious education, or doctrinal preachers. For what end? To what

purpose? They can make no real answer except Saint Paul's, "That I may save some." Everything here has to be filled with the saving passion and controlled by the saving motive.

May I introduce what I have to say on one other subject by quoting two men, one an eminent teacher of social Christianity, the other a famous evangelist? I asked the first what interest he had in securing individual conversions. He replied that he had absolutely no interest in them. I asked the revivalist what interest he had in the social bearing of Christianity and he replied that he did not care a rap for it. The one had reacted to a foolish extreme against the conversions that are so individual as to mean little, the other was laying an utterly false emphasis upon personal conversion as though Jesus had never seen beyond that. The two men represent types that we set over against each other, views that we choose between, saying, "I am of one and I am of the other." And we know the result; we sadly know it. We are perfectly familiar with men and women claiming to be saved who mean next to nothing to the kingdom of Christ. And we have seen reform break down and social movements and motives come to grief because they were dependent upon unsaved men, men without such salvation as we are thinking of. Moral reforms have come to nothing because they have not had the support, or the direction,

because they have not been in the hands of a moralized society, a society of men and women saved to Christ's ethics and principles. Reforms are not good substitutes for spiritual awakenings, nor traditional revivals for social righteousness. But let us frankly admit that we have abundantly proved that we "cannot get golden conduct in society out of leaden instincts in the individual."

Many ministers have been and are off their center. They have been trying to make better communities out of men and women who have not been transformed in their personal lives or renewed in their social ideals. Ministers and others have shown an utter lack of power to achieve real reform because they have no power of Christ within themselves. You cannot make the mind of Christ unless you have the mind of Christ.

Take this tremendous matter of war and peace. What is the real basis of peace in the world? Christ's ideals and Christ's principles. What can be done, what has been done with the ideals and principles of Christ when they are in the hands of unsaved, unChristlike men the world around? Does any sane man expect to get a Christlike civilization in Europe, Africa, Asia, and America, or in the world as a whole from men who are not even thinking in the terms of a Christlike life and character, or Christlike principles and relations? Some years ago Newman

Smyth defined Christian ethics as the science of "living well," which is personal, "with one another," which is social, "according to Christ." But that is what we mean by salvation. Getting people to do that, speaking broadly, is what we mean by saving some.

We have to keep the Master's own story and steadiness before us all the time. Honestly, one can hardly bear to read his story through in the light of his simple persistence. At Christmas time a friend gave us John Masefield's "The Trial of Jesus." We read it aloud. It was not easy to control voices and feelings as we came to the words that the poet makes Jesus say at the end. He has made Longinus say: "If a man believes anything up to the point of dying on the cross for it, he will get others to believe it." Not in those words alone but in a dozen places that sentiment appeared in the books I was reading during the preparation of these studies. Earnest men, not all belonging to one school of thinking, nevertheless are one in their feeling of the urgency of Jesus for the fulfillment of his saving purpose. The historic Christ who came to redeem men from all evil is felt to be and declared to be the living Christ still eagerly striving in this human life to make a new creation out of it. More than one volume has made me feel the intense urgency of his present effort to achieve his original and evidently unchanging purpose

for men. I am sure this must be a real understanding of him. Every New Testament teaching, every attitude of his earthly life, every word about the future means the same thing. He is in the world and the world is being made by him. He will not lose heart in the eternal struggle to get what he loved enough to die for. This seems to many careful students of life to-day the most passionate personal fact in life. And it gives an overwhelming significance to following Jesus and preaching Christ. There seems no way except to go the whole way with him in purpose, passion and practice.

One reads those words of Masefield's, one thinks over the motive and the methods of the Saviour, the price he paid for our salvation, and all our small motives, all our petty methods, all our calculating of cost seem the unworthy things they are. Then one finds himself saying softly, possibly singing softly, words that were familiar to an earlier generation than ours:

"But none of the ransomed ever knew
How deep were the waters crossed,
Or how dark was the night that the Lord passed through,
Ere he found his sheep that was lost."

And maybe one adds: "What he died for he is determined to get," and I am determined to help him get it. God help me, so I will.

V. THE LIVING PERSONS

LECTURE V

THE LIVING PERSONS

I SUPPOSE we would agree that religion has supremely to do with persons, the personal God and other persons. We would also agree, I hope, that the making of a high type of person and establishing right relations between persons are the supreme achievements of life. Must we not also agree that men have real difficulty thinking of God in the definite terms of personality and that to many men he is a rather vague and altogether mystical idea? Must we not also admit that while we firmly believe in the eternally living, present Christ, we have real difficulty in making a historic person, like the historic Christ, a reality in our own personal experience? I remember hearing Bishop Foss once say to an Annual Conference: "I know that he lives because I met him this morning. He walked with me to this church as I came." And those who sat by and listened believed it to be true, though many of them had no such definite sense of Christ in their own experience. And, indeed, this must be so, hard as it is to keep it clear in our experience and also keep it real in our best and steadiest thinking. Too much Christian experi-

ence seems to be an experience of experience and not an experience of Christ in life. We do not serve our faith well when we befog our minds or shut our mental eyes as to these things.

Let us now make a few general statements so as to start ourselves into this final study. Christianity is essentially a personal matter—personal in its source, personal in its purpose, personal in its ideals and relations, personal in its method and motive, personal in its power and outcome. Its supreme figure is a person trying by every means to make known to the world of other persons the personal God whom he claimed to know, whom he claimed to resemble, whom he claimed to reveal in character and in life. It was in a Person that God expressed himself and made known his thought, his character, his purpose and himself. The Word became a Person. It is the only way. And he keeps on doing it in this way. The supreme achievement of revelation was to give the world a personal idea and knowledge of God so that men looking at Jesus Christ could say, "God is like that in character."

Christianity's supreme business is personal, the living up to the Supreme Person, the making him known in the charm and wonder of his personality and the power of his life, the bringing of other persons under his influence, that they may cease to be the persons they are and may become like him in character and purpose and

relations; may accept his ideals for life and society, may live in a large personal fellowship—which many have limited to a narrow religious fellowship—with this eternally living Person. Our age is strong in its emphasis upon things, upon materials, upon the forces it can see. Christianity is strong on personality. This business of "saving some" that we are talking about is at the heart of it a wholly personal transaction. It can best be described as the process by which one person who knows Jesus Christ in his own life brings other persons to Christ that those other persons may catch his spirit, submit to his influence, be remade in character and attitude according to his standards and by his power. If the word "personal" did not exist, we should now be compelled to invent it. Christianity simply could not get along without it.

Now, I never coveted more earnestly the gift of clear and telling speech than in this closing hour when we are thinking of the living persons involved in the saving process. Indeed, I covet even more than this power of personal utterance the personal presence and influence of that chief Person who is at the center of all our thinking, who is "the master light of all our seeing." I cannot think of him as absent at all, but I am eager that, being present, he shall have his way in what is said, how it is said, and how it may be heard, and that we shall, as our fathers would

have said, "realize his presence." It must be as bitter for him now as it was when he was physically on the earth to be in a crowd that is not thinking with him, not obedient to him, not in moral or social fellowship with him, not caring much about him one way or another. This may be offensive mysticism to some and it may be very crudely stated, but I am trying to indicate my feeling as to the real personal presence. If he is not here, then there is no use for the rest of us to be here talking about him. We once heard Joseph Parker preach from the text: "When the multitude saw that Jesus was not there . . . they themselves got into the boats and came to Capernaum, seeking Jesus." In his dramatic way, Parker cried out: "If you find yourself in any place where Jesus is not, go straight away from that place. Go where he is." It made a great impression upon our daughter, who sat with us. The whole thing was a living picture to her as she sat under the spell of Parker's words. She was not conscious of anything except the presence or absence of Jesus and his disciples. To the end of her short life she kept in mind the blazing sentence: "If you find yourself in any place where Jesus is not, go straight away from that place. Go where he is."

1. Let us look first at the living persons involved in this matter of saving.

Do you remember Phillips Brooks'—I always

have to quote him sooner or later—discussion of reading a biography? There are always three people present when one is reading a biography, the subject, the writer, and the reader. The writer is introducing the reader to the subject so that the reader shall come to know him as he is or was. And the best biography is the one in which the writer best introduces the subject and the reader so that the subject shall make his own impression on the reader, or so mediate between them that this result shall come. Two things follow, one that making a perfect biography is the one most perfect piece of writing, just as painting a portrait is the highest achievement in art; the other that the Gospels become rich and throbbing with this personal quality. "Make the New Testament a book of dogmas," says Brooks, "and its vitality is gone. Make it a book of laws and it grows hard and untimely. Make it a biography and it is a true book of life. Make it the history of Jesus of Nazareth and the world holds it in its heart forever."[1] As one reads those words he sees again all the personal figures and feels the intense personal urge in those early chapters of our Christian history. He sees John the Baptist with swift, bold strokes of his brush painting the portrait of the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world. Behold him, says that most impressionistic artist. He

[1] *Essays and Addresses,* p. 428. E. P. Dutton & Company.

sees Andrew going after his brother Simon, that he may "bring him to Jesus" for the beginning of that transforming experience in which the Master works upon the disciple, making of him through the years the saved man that he became under that influence. He sees this very Paul getting his personal vision on the way to Damascus, then going off into Arabia to adjust his inherited beliefs to this new fact, and fix it in his life as a force and motive, then going out to make a place for it in the world. And he went to make that place in Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome not just as a new way of seeing truth or a new form of statement for the truth, but as a new personal relation. He was not thinking henceforth, driven over his wide ranging missionary field, fighting with wild beasts or tossed on raging seas, merely of a Christocentric theology, or a better creed for Judaism. He was thinking of the saving Christ as the personal center of life. His letters groan and at times almost break with his struggle to get that personal thing said, to get other men to see it and themselves get into it. If ever any man subjected human speech to spiritual strain, Paul did it in the effort to state the personal meaning of Jesus Christ. He did not do it as many evangelists have done through the centuries, in an evident effort at violent, lurid speech. He was not thinking of his rhetoric, but of that saving,

living Christ to whom he wanted to win other men for life's salvation and strength. Long afterward a young man in London, named George Williams, got acquainted with Jesus Christ and just set out to make other young men acquainted with him, and the Young Men's Christian Association was born, born with a saving purpose.

But all the time there are those living persons, as in the reading of the biography, the saved person, the Saving Person and the person being introduced by the saved person to the Saving Person. Or, as in the study of the portrait, there are the painter of it, the subject of it, and the person studying the features as painted, in the effort to come to the character. And the great epochs in a preacher's life, as in the life of the church itself, are those epochs in which his personal vision is clearest and his personal endeavor most constant. "All my life," said Bruce, "my effort has been to see Him and to show Him." This, I think, must be what we mean by preaching Christ and must be what we mean by trying to save some. There surely is no other way than to see Christ and to show him.

You do not need to be told as though it were new, but only reminded because it is so easy to forget, that this emphasis upon the living persons makes the work of saving men at once simpler and richer, easier and harder. I suspect that we have made salvation too complex and

then have tried to relieve its complexity by toning it down so as to make it seem easier. Whereas, surely we must relieve its complexity by actual simplicity and make no attempt to tone it down or make it seem easy. We can get rid of some difficulties that do not belong to it, but not by lowering the standards. If salvation is ever made to appear a small thing or an easy thing, it ceases to be salvation in Jesus Christ. That is at once rich and harmonious, compelling and hard. It can be interpreted only in the light of Christ's personality and the influence of his personality upon other personalities than his own. He is the definition and the standard.

And we are not treating him or anyone else fairly unless we bring ourselves and others right up to Jesus as he is and let him do in us all that he really wants to do. We must keep men steadily and for long years, with unbleared eyes and clear-seeing minds facing him, until they are transformed into his likeness. Think of Paul flinging that before those Corinthians! They would say that Paul was excited and using superlatives. For they, like ourselves, were, as someone has vividly put it, "inoculated with Christianity" so that they would not have an acute and violent attack of it. The church has never half believed that surpassing word about transformation into the same image. We think it good enough for sermons and that maybe in

some far future it may work out, but we are not foolish and extravagant, unreasonable and fanatical in our beliefs now. What is the use? Why entertain unreasonable and impossible expectations? Does any church really believe it to-day? Is the vision of likeness to Christ a vision that has real, actual force in our thought or our faith? Of course we do not doubt or deny it, since it is so clearly taught, but neither do we expect it in any potent, keen way.

2. Let us see how this idea of the living persons in the process of "saving some" affects the idea and meaning of preaching, the new idea of religious education and the large idea of saving the world. This personal emphasis both simplifies and enriches all of them and sets them in a real place for us. Indeed, it is hard to see that we can get much further with the modern world, with its youth, with its men of science and learning, with its confused, uneducated men and women, and especially with the non-Christian world, with whose religions we have yet to come to close grips, except by the full use of personalism with all its religious implications. If Glover be right, as I think he is, in saying that "the Christian Church is not making enough of Jesus Christ," then we must make enough of him for the new and better day. We can go on a while and get ahead some distance just by the way we have been going, but we are not going to save

the world by it. And I hope you are not content with what we are doing, or satisfied with the way or the rate of speed at which we are going.

What do we mean by "preaching Christ," and why should we preach a Person, even that Person? One almost hesitates to use the terms in view of the shallow meanings that have been attached to them, the cant and pharisaism that so often attend their use, the doctrinal narrowness and reaction that use them as a shibboleth of orthodox superiority, the way superficial men have read their own superficialness *into* preaching Christ instead of getting the big, vital, overwhelming meanings *out* of it. But we shall deserve well of our own and other generations if we can in any real way help to recover the full significance of the only terms that really describe true preaching. I am of the opinion that this is the way for us to recover "the lost confidence" of preaching. Preaching "must make mighty affirmations," or it ceases to speak even with the tongues of men and angels. A thousand subjects have got into the modern pulpit about which no mighty affirmations can be made. Some of them do not belong in the pulpit at all. Some do belong there at times, but not with major emphasis. And some modern ministers are speaking without authority, and some are assuming an authority they do not have, in regions to which their authority does not extend, while they miss that real

supremacy that does belong to them as preachers of Christ.

When will we learn the importance of the greatest personalities, the greatest Personality most of all? When will we get into the big meaning of Saint John's words, "The life was the light of men"? When will we learn, for preaching purposes, the value of offering Christ as the object of trust rather than a doctrine about him as a test of faith? When will we make enough of the creative power of the personal Christ as that life shows itself in wealth of truth and love and goodness to us men and influence over us men? We sons of the Reformation are not making enough of our heritage, that thing our fathers obtained at frightful cost for us when they opened to us directly the way between God and man so that the total divine life, not a broken partial expression, might move as it does in Jesus Christ upon our total human nature. And we cannot make mighty preaching for our modern day by any other way than this way. Petty subjects, petty objects, or a petty grasp of large subjects and large objects will doom our ministry to an ever-dwindling place in life. I am not concerned to save the ministry for its own sake, but to save it for men's sake. I see no way to save the ministry except to fill it with the large passion for saving men in a Christlike way and through a personal relation to Christ.

I wonder how vividly we think of *ourselves* in that group of living persons. There are words of Jesus that we can hardly bear to read. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." That is, nobody is going to find the way to God and nobody is going really to know what God is like if I do not show him. The minister stands there in the eternal personal triangle, the Saving God on one side, the man needing the Saving God on the other. These are two of the persons. And this minister of Jesus is the third who is to bring the other two together. I do not need to say over again what for. Jesus himself is in the eternal personal triangle. This minister of Jesus is also in the eternal triangle of living persons. Here on one side stands Jesus himself, able to save, eager to save, mighty to save; to save in that large way that we are thinking of. Here on the other side is the unsaved man needing everything in his life that Jesus has in his. Here between the two is this saved man, this partly saved man in process of being perfectly saved, knowing both the others. Is he going to keep the other two apart or bring them together? I know men, and you know them, who are actually blocking the way of men to Christ and Christ to men. They are keeping youth and Christ apart. They are keeping scholars and Christ apart. They are keeping poor men away from Christ. They are keeping rich men

away from Christ. They are between Christ and a lot of strong groups as dividers and obstacles rather than as mediators and uniters. Does a minister see at all the personal meaning of his presence as one of those living persons? If he does not see that, see it in the large, see it in its near reach and its world reach, in the name of all that is good, what does he see? What is he going to remember at the end of his day of life in this ministry? That he preached much sound doctrine, that he spoke with the tongues of men and angels, that he gathered great crowds, that he had many degrees, that he was moderator of the assembly, or bishop in the church, that he raised much money, and built big churches? Is that personal enough to warm a man's soul as he goes into the chill at the end? Will there, then, be three persons there, or more, the Master of the saved life, the man himself saved by grace, and others who will say to the minister: "You introduced me to that Master. You did the best thing any man ever does for another"? I do not want to be foolish or sentimental, but I have nothing except this personal ministry, no place that I care for except my place in that eternal personal triangle. Saving some seems to mean just the bringing of a person or a group to that other Person that one or many may become like him, may share his character, share his principles, share his purpose, be like him, help him

and be with him now and always. The mathematics of this personal relation is very alluring even to me who am not strong on mathematics. I saw it all the other night while reading my dear friend Goodspeed's essay on "One and One Make Two." He said: "In chemistry one and one may make an explosion; socially one and one may make a scene; spiritually one and one may make a salvation." That is it, to get them together, to make a salvation. See what one and one will make when one of them is Jesus Christ and the other is any man.

So with that other matter again that we call religious education. The emphasis in education has been quite too much upon subjects and not nearly enough on persons. Real teachers are teachers of persons. In religious education the eternal personal triangle still exists. Will you read or reread Phillips Brooks' address to Yale men entitled "The Teaching of Religion"? You will not do it. You will slightly remember if you are old enough that you did once read it, or you will make a note of it and then will find it difficult to find the address, and by and by you will even forget that any reference was made to it. So I am free to use a bit of it now. Brooks describes with characteristic insight the three historic ways of teaching religion. One method takes the purely intellectual course. "The church is a schoolroom; religion is taught when

certain truths have been imparted. This is the method of the catechism and of the worst sort of doctrinal sermon. It is the hard method of hard Protestantism." Another thinks religion is taught when a feeling is created. This is the method that stirs men up to feel certain feelings and thinks religion is taught when men have felt the feelings. "It is the soft method of soft Protestantism." And the third takes still a different course. It sets out to govern men's actions. It drills. It tells men what they must do to be religious. "There they are, the dogmatist saying know this and believe this, the revivalist saying feel this, and the moralist saying, do this —treating religion as formulated truth, or as emotional feeling or as practical drill."[1]

I have the greatest concern for this movement known as religious education, and a lot of fear lest it become academic, scholastic, or superior. It has so many chances to go wrong and only one to go right. It can go right only by being moved by the saving passion and kept alive with the personal quality. The living persons always make the school; they make it peculiarly in this deeply significant realm. What is the task of the director of religious education? Just what it is in the pastoral life, "to bring the personal Christ to the personal human nature, to

[1] *Essays and Addresses,* pp. 38, 39. E. P. Dutton & Company.

bring the life of Christ into the life of a man." This teacher stands there between these two persons again to bring them together. Bringing the life of Christ into the life of a man must be the modern practical meaning of incarnation. But do not imagine that this is easy. We are making our work less complex by removing certain accretions from it, but we are making it much harder and much nobler just because it is being made harder.

Here lies our way also with modern youth. We have a tremendous appeal to youth which we are not making as we ought. We are confusing it with a lot of things that do not belong, making a lot of conditions that are not real, trying to cover a field that is too broad to cover, trying to fill the wineskins belonging to youth with both old wine and old skins! But we all know perfectly well that youth responds to personality. It is not looking, especially the best of it is not, for second-rate loyalties, second-rate leaders, or allegiances with second-rate persons. It is not easy to win youth to a system of doctrines stated in abstract terms, or a scheme of ordinances, or a mystical experience. Our one best chance with youth is to lead it to a personal life based upon a personal relation, transformed by that personal relation, given its outlook on truth through Him, having its real experience with Him, testing its life by Him, taking up its life tasks with Him.

You can challenge the best youth to seek the mind of Christ, to stake its ambition on being acceptable to him, to give him the pre-eminence, and to regulate life "according to Christ." Youth does not care for low standards, no matter what its own actual life is. And it does not care much for abstractions. I would hardly go to a student conference and ask it to "stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis," but I would go anywhere in the world and ask the best youth of any land, those who are going to control the future, "to stand or fall by the noblest person." A stronger relation is needed for youth, but it cannot be got by stiffening up the secondary requirements. Only a stronger Christ than ever has been presented by us, a Christ making stiffer personal demands upon youth, the real Christ whose very personality is contagious and inspiring will answer with youth.

"Saving some" comes to be just that personal process of making Jesus to be the way of life, the truth of life, even life itself in other men. It is so relating men to Jesus that they will see themselves in the light of their real sonship to God. Glover says that "in human history the great motives have been the high conception, the great examples and the deep personal attachment." You cannot talk to college men and women, for example, about personal identification with and personal surrender to the most per-

fect creed ever framed. But you cannot talk about anything else than personal identification with and personal surrender to Jesus Christ, the most perfect Person that ever lived. Does a certain feeling ever sweep over you almost to the point of overwhelming you when you see a promising youth and think of Christ? Do you say to yourself: "Oh, *if* I could just get those two together. It would mean so much to both of them —to Jesus and the youth." Maybe Andrew in a dim, vague way had that in mind when he felt that he must get Peter and Jesus together. Of course he could not have had any full idea of it because Andrew never had seen what Jesus could make of another person. Maybe Jesus himself was thinking of this personal influence when he picked out some to be with him in the School of Christ, "that they might hear what he said, see what he did, and learn what he was, so that he might send them forth with a message, a program, and new personalities."[2] Think of his changing Peter from sand into a rock, sand being the raw material of which rock is made. Once or twice in the process it crumbled and went all to pieces, but it held together in the man at last. Let your imagination run on the scribe who said, "I will go along with you," and on the other one who would not, but rather went

[2] See *In the School of Christ,* McDowell, and particularly *The Training of the Twelve,* Bruce.

away with his wealth. What a personality that attractive youth might have become!

Christian experience in its essence is the personal experiencing of Christ in the life, not simply the experience of an experience. We have yet to see in its perfection what Jesus Christ does in and to a personality that wholly and for a lifetime submits itself to him and co-operates with him. This is the continuous, creative process. And no other personality in history is so creative as Christ's. Christ in a man makes a new creation, the basis for everything else. And this at last is the meaning of "life that is life indeed," that one person knows another. And this is our appeal to youth, the appeal we are so largely failing to make.

I must leave this and hurry on to a miserable paragraph, miserable because it can be only a paragraph now, about these living persons as we come face to face with our Christian hope in such countries as India, China, and Japan, whose millions have religions centuries old and very powerful. "Saving some" is not the small business that many have thought it to be. Jesus had the world in his view. Saint Paul after him had the nations in his eye and on his heart. Whatever problems we have or have not worked out, we are only at the edge of the problem of the non-Christian world and the questions brought to us by our new knowledge of other religions.

We have probably not thought through our evangelistic task in the light of our new contact with the people we used to call heathen and to think of without any adequate comprehension of the depth and character of the religions they already have. Every new field of human life and thought opened to us has its bearing on our religious problem. The science of comparative religion is new even to scholars, and utterly unknown in its significance to all except scholars. And it creates our vastest problem to-day as we think of saving some and take all the world into our view. And the problem cannot be worked out simply as a theory, in a library or in an academic way. Nearly half a century ago I bought and read Hardwick's *Christ and Other Masters,* Clarke's *Ten Great Religions,* and other works then current. I listened gratefully with my fellow students to President Warren's profound and revealing lectures which largely pioneered the way into this mighty and mysterious subject. These studies literally opened up to generations of students, who had been traditionally brought up, new conceptions of Christianity and of religion itself. What we then studied had immense value for us in our later ministries. Those studies gave us both light and motive as we thought of foreign missions and preached on the salvation of the world. But it is clearer now than it was then that we were only getting our

theoretical insight into the problem. It was easy to make plain the supremacy of Christ to ourselves and our congregations as long as we could do it in the academic way. But the issue between Christ and other masters, Christianity and other religions, can be worked out practically only face to face, where Christ meets Buddha and Confucius, where Christianity confronts other religions in the lives of the millions who live in them and by them. It is Saint Paul's largest problem all over again in our day.

And that issue can be worked out only where those religions are. We are face to face in America with a material civilization, with all those conditions that so vitally affect our work of evangelism, the conditions that make evangelism or saving some so difficult here. It is an unsolved question with us yet whether we can spiritualize and moralize this life about us according to Christ. We have not yet done it in the United States or anywhere else. And we have to do that where that problem is. An unsaved, an unspiritual, an unintellectual church cannot do it. We have to serve an East which is called spiritual and a West which is called material, each probably being partly spiritual and partly material after their kind like the things named in the chapter on creation there in Genesis. But the issue between Christ and Mohammed, Christ and Buddha, Christ and Confucius cannot be worked

out here, nor at long range from here. "Saving some," we cannot say too often, reaches out to the ends of the world. We have our own opinion of the Korans and Vedas and the Sayings. Probably the educated Hindoos and Mohammedans and Confucianists would have their opinion also if we should put into their hands a work like Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom.* Indeed, in view of our own difficulties, after all our historic and traditional acquaintance with and use of the Bible, we need not be surprised if they are more than a little perplexed with it. What, then, is the way to that possible winning of the world for which we long and pray, of which we speak with more assurance than present facts and existing conditions warrant? We are not fatalists. We are believers, but not stupid believers who fold their hands and expect everything to be all right anyhow. Have you read the vivid book by E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of the Indian Road?* I call attention here to only a single paragraph born out of his remarkable experience as an evangelist to India's educated classes. He declares that when he went to India he began by "trying to hold a long line from Genesis to Revelation, on to Western civilization and the Western church." He was forced by his effort to save some to take his stand at only one point, that is, at Christ. With Christ he thinks India can be won, but not with Christ

loaded up and overloaded with a lot of impedimenta. Gandhi told him "not to adulterate Christ or tone him down or to try to gain favor for a mild Christianity, only to present the real Christ, mighty, strong, compelling and vital."

But you see what all this means. We cannot win the non-Christian world to a scheme of doctrine wrought out in Western terms, terms largely outworn, changing even for us at present into other and more modern terms. We cannot save it by trying to impose on it usages and practices belonging to our history but not to the history of Asia or Africa, and having no meaning in life to them. We cannot save it by an equal emphasis on the whole of the long line. Anyhow, we are not doing it anywhere. We can only lose by that way. We cannot save India or China if we insist upon dragging them with *their* background over the long Jewish road with its special landmarks which meant something to the Jews, but mean nothing to the Chinese or Indians. Christ and Paul both declared us free from a lot of that painful literalism. Christ has come. Christ is here. Let us go forward from that supreme fact to that supreme Person. We are not making our task easy by making it personal, by laying our emphasis where it belongs, upon the living Person. But we are making it possible. There is a heaven-wide dif-

ference between a task both hard and impossible and one that is only hard.

You see the whole big non-Christian world is confused about God. It has gods many and lords many, but it has no god in all its countless host that can save it. We can go anywhere with the God of Jesus Christ. We weaken our approach when we do not make the most of what we have. We strengthen it by using our best facts for what they are worth in themselves and in comparison with anything that anybody else has. Probably nowhere in our whole evangelistic effort have we failed more largely to do our best than in our impact upon the heathen world. It is bad enough not to make the most of Jesus Christ anywhere. It is unpardonable when we have *him* to offer to India and China if we fail to do it as perfectly as possible. The only way we can get Christianity into those lands is for living persons who may be called missionaries to take the Living Person just as he is to those other living persons whom we call heathen, and ought to call brothers.

Again it is the eternal personal triangle. I am thinking all the time of Saint Paul's ruling idea, the idea of salvation, of "saving some." And now we are face to face with the biggest application of it that Christ's church has ever faced. And Christianity is the only one of these world religions that has a living, personal Saviour.

Every one of them has doctrines, every one of them has ethics and duties, worship and ritual. But only one has anybody in it who even knows how to pronounce such words as forgiveness, new life, love, and hope. Only one of them knows the word "redemption." Only one knows what a Person like Christ can do for a person like anyone else. And we can take our stand anywhere, beside any temple or mosque, by any river or shrine, with the living Saviour and have immediate appeal, unanswerable appeal to living men and women. We need to pull ourselves up standing ever and again as we face the task of Christianity in its new modern issue with other religions. Its unique, unmatched, universal strength is in its redeeming Christ. Why make ourselves weak when we might be strong everywhere? Why not simply, bravely, confidently, in any land, with any people, make enough of Jesus Christ the Saviour? If we only had the story of a dead Christ to tell we would be as helpless as anybody. If we only had the story of a great teacher or mighty prophet or wonder worker, we would be on a lower level than the one we hold. Whenever a living missionary sits down with a living heathen to save him by all means and at any cost, the glory of the scene and the hope of the effort lie in that third Person who is present though invisible. It is the same story beside the Yangtse, the Ganges,

the Nile, and the Mississippi—the saved person is bringing the Saving Person to the unsaved person, or the unsaved person to the Saving Person so that the eternal miracle may occur again: "One and one make a salvation."

Again: The real undertaking of the task of saving some by all means and at any cost with a Christlike or even with an apostolic passion will reveal two things: (1) The full meaning of personality for personality, the influence of personality on personality, and (2) the real place of the Holy Spirit—the present God—in modern life for the salvation of the whole of it. Of the latter I have already spoken.

Take the first: We make a doctrine of the living Christ just as we make a philosophy of God. We forget the truth that Professor Seth stated when he said: "God is an experience—not an object." We know that it is orthodox to stand by the Jesus of history and to affirm the truth of the Christ of experience. Those are very precious doctrines, and we make a lot of them everywhere except in our experience. And there we too largely think of experience as an emotion rather than as a personal relation. We need to have an experience not of an experience but of God in Christ. We are sound enough on the meaning of great men. We agree with Emerson and Carlyle about their value, though probably a low estimate of personality as compared with a lot

of other things is the prevailing error in our thinking. Big fortunes, for example, blind us to the size of personalities. And yet in here "where the Jesus of history becomes the Christ of experience," we reach the reality of religion. And is this not the place at which all the terms like psychology, personality, influence of person upon person reach their deepest meaning? Psychology's chief interest is not just the development of heightened efficiency, it is the creation of personality. And that is not done by abstract influences working impersonally. That is due at last to the influence of one personality upon another. It is so in life. This gives meaning to friendship, that strange best thing, with its fellowship and intense intermingling of personalities. The power of ideas, of habits, of ideals, of examples we all recognize, but at last the influence of personality upon personality, the penetration of personality by personality goes deeper than anything else in life. We know the enlarging power of larger truth, the expansive power of new affections and interests, but the growing influence of another life than our own goes deeper and reaches further than anything else that affects us. Dale used to say in substance: "Some have received Jesus Christ. Others have not. Compared with this every other distinction is insignificant."

The New Testament fairly groans with the

effort to say what Jesus Christ means in another personality. It comes up to it from every side, it goes through all the twelve gates that lead into a man's life, into the whole city of life. It talks of having Christ formed in us, of being transformed by the renewing of our minds, of being new creations, made into the same image, and a score of other passages, no one of which is so impressive as the total atmosphere of this personal book in whose pages these living persons live. In its deepest meanings it is not the impact of truth, though that is tremendous, nor the impact of ritual or sacrament, nor of deed or emotion, not even at its heart the impact of the cross, imperial as that is. It is the spiritual, personal impact of Christ himself, Christ teaching the truth, Christ working in life, Christ on the cross and his influence upon those ancient, modern men, Peter and John, Andrew and Thomas. And all this not, as evangelism has too often said, simply as the beginning of a life, but, as evangelism must say, that unceasing personal activity that keeps working away at men in America and China, Europe and Africa, until Christ gets that new man who may fairly be called a saved man, that new humanity which may fairly be called a saved humanity, "mature in Christ."

Men are always looking for new discoveries, but they are always looking outside of themselves. Maybe the next real discovery in human

life will be a new breed of men, the kind for which the whole creation groans and travails, the kind that will exist when the perfect Person has got people to be like him, when the full meaning of personality is seen, when the full influence of his personality is realized in the redemption of men. For he was not just the Saviour *once* in history. And he is not just the Saviour *once* in human life, as in the act of forgiveness. He ever lives and loves. He ever lives and works at the saving task. The living persons, the Saviour, those being saved, those needing salvation make about the only permanent thing in this changing world.

When the father of Doctor Simpson, Drummond's successor, died, it is said that they found in the margin of his personal New Testament these words written in his own hand: "He is in the world, the world is being made by him, the world does not recognize him, but to all who do receive him he gives the power to become children of God." The saving process goes on. "And whenever a man comes to be in Christ there is a new creation." Maybe *our* new discovery is to be the personality of Jesus; the discovery of his eternally creative personality in its power to intellectualize, moralize, and spiritualize other personalities. It is easier to make things, but the supreme achievement even for God himself is to make Christlike persons, to awaken, to re-

lease, to create men according to Christ. Maybe this is what Jesus meant when he said that the Spirit of truth would glorify him, receive of his and show it unto men.

But, finally, back of all motive and method must be the evangelistic man, the man who will save some at any cost. We cannot become saving men, however, just by trying to save everybody else. Religion in its large perfection is necessary to us as to others. Part of our weakness, our essential, tragic weakness as evangelists, is due to our own shallow and imperfect salvation. The light in us may not have become absolute darkness, but it does not shine more and more unto our own perfect day. With all too many of us our growth stops in middle life or before. "No one is fit to be a teacher in whose own mental process education has ceased to go on." Men cannot be eternally vital evangelists unless the saving process is eternally going on in themselves. The man will do the work. There is no substitute for him. He is the final necessity. Every age is new, every community different from every other. Always there will be old theology and new theology, old learning and new learning, but in any age or community holding theology new or old, equipped with learning new or old, the good minister of Jesus Christ must forever be the kind of man who brings men to God and holds them there for their redemption.

Such a one will shine as the stars forever and ever. The ministry knows no other joy equal to the joy of doing this, has no other rewards equal to the reward of doing this. You can go through your ministry without it. You may be pretty useful and somewhat happy without it. You may come to distinction and honor without it. You may win some of the conspicuous places and prizes of the world. You may do all this, or you may do all this and also you may win men to God through all your life. But at the end of the day, whether the day be long or short, I know what you will be most glad to remember. I know how you will then be glad to go into that other Minister's presence. I know what you will wish then to say, reverently and humbly: "These are they whom thou gavest me, in New York, in Bombay, or in country place. Not one of them is lost." And you will forget the steep mountains and the stormy nights, the wild beasts, and the battles. And that other Minister will say, "Well done," and will put on your head a crown, and lo! there will be in it many stars. Then you will wonder anew at the grace of it all and will gratefully cast your crowns at his feet. They are for him, and not for you. It is enough for you to have them to cast before him.

Hear his own voice speaking his own words: "I came down not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me; and this is the will of him

that sent me, that of those that he hath given me I should lose—not one." And may we not hear him humbly saying also, "I did not try to save myself. I gave myself utterly to save others"? And these words make us remember Matthew Arnold's poem on Rugby Chapel, which is the story of his own father and the boys of the college. There is the vivid picture of "the lonely inn 'mid the rocks."

"The lonely inn 'mid the rocks;
Where the gaunt and taciturn host
Stands on the threshold, the wind
Shaking his thin white hairs—
Holds his lantern to scan
Our storm-beat figures, and asks:
Whom in our party we bring?
Whom we have left in the snow?

"Sadly we answer: We bring
Only ourselves! we lost
Sight of the rest in the storm.
Hardly ourselves we fought through,
Stripp'd, without friends, as we are.
Friends, companions, and train,
The avalanche swept from our side.

"But thou would'st not *alone*
Be saved, my father! *alone*
Conquer and come to thy goal,
Leaving the rest in the wild.
We were weary, and we
Fearful, and we in our march
Fain to drop down and to die.

Still thou turnedst, and still
Beckonedst the trembler, and still
Gavest the weary thy hand.

"If, in the paths of the world,
Stones might have wounded thy feet,
Toil or dejection have tried
Thy spirit, of that we saw
Nothing—to us thou wast still
Cheerful, and helpful, and firm!
Therefore to thee it was given
Many to save with thyself;
And, at the end of thy day,
O faithful shepherd! to come,
Bringing thy sheep in thy hand."[2]

And now lest these multitudes of words that I have used may make you forget the real words that we must remember and the real thing we have to do, I say them over again, to close this study: "I am become all things to all men, if by any means, or at any cost, I may save some."

And yet after all this long discussion I wonder if I ought not to cut a word off from the title and only use four words for our final memory: "I may save some." There is the shining, burning reality lifting itself out of all the words we have spoken and heard. Nothing else so good as this has ever been said of us men. It lifts salvation far beyond being saved which in our long

[2] *Matthew Arnold's Poetical Works*, pp. 307-308. Macmillan and Company, London and New York, 1891.

history has often developed into tragic selfishness. It throws us, apostles like Saint Paul when Christianity was young, and ministers of to-day when Christianity is fighting its way through raging waves, into a vital fellowship with that One who would not save himself, but would save others. With him we can if we will. "I may save some." Then, by his grace, God helping me, so I will.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

BV 3790 .M146 1928

McDowell, William Fraser,
1858-1937.

That I may save some

24
M1

BV 3790 .M146 1928

McDowell, William Fraser,
1858-1937.

That I may save some

44

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV3790.M146 1928
McDowell, Wil That I may save some /
3 0645 0003 4693 8